TERMS \$2.50 a year, if paid in advance or within the year; otherwise, 35.

### THE

# IUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY

JAS. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D. J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D. FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D.D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D.D., LL.D.
PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D.D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D.D.
PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, 1907.

GETTYSBURG: WILLIAM B. HAMMOND, 142 CARLISLE STREET. 1907.

### CONTENTS.

ARTICLES	PAGE
I. THE WORD OF GOD THE MEANS OF GRACE, By George U. Wenner, D.D.	151
II. CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY BY DR. VALENTINE, BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	166
III. LUTHERAN GERMANY AND THE BOOK OF CONCORD, BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, Ph.D.	178
IV. THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL: A SUPPLEMENT, BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.	195
V. SHALL WE SUPPLEMENT THE CATECHISM? BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.	225
VI. THE RELIGION OF PALESTINE AT THE TIME OF THE ISRAELITIC CONQUEST,	239
VII. PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTIONS OF GOD, BY REV. A. E. DIETZ.	259
VIII. THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION,	265
IX. PROFESSOR KAWERAU ON SECTS IN GERMANY, BY PROFESSOR J. A. FAULKNER, D.D.	273
X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE,	289

Mental Development in the Child and the Race; Methods and Processes—The Religious Conception of the World—Ralph Waldo Emerson—Freedom in the Church—The Book of Psalms—Telling Bible Stories—A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels—The Coming Man—Modern Poets and Christian Teaching—Christian Missions and Social Progress, a Sociological Study of Foreign Missions—Atlantic Monthly—Die Herrlichkeit Gottes in der Natur—Christmas Eve at Eddington Place—Ramuldu—Sundays in London.

### THE

## LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1907.

### ARTICLE I.

THE WORD OF GOD, THE MEANS OF GRACE.

By George U. Wenner D.D.

We are living in an age of new ideas. In our knowledge of the physical world great advances have been made during the past thirty years. Radium, electricity and x-rays have opened up to us new worlds, although, far from solving the riddle of the universe, they have only deepened its mystery. In the field of religion, also, we have entered a new era. Old. bottles are bursting because of the new wine that has been poured in. Old ecclesiastical labels, such as Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, are almost worthless for distinguishing the real differences that exist among the various kinds of religious thought.

There are many shades of difference, but ultimately we shall find but two schools. These confront each other with an antipodal view of the world. Call them by whatever name you please, old and new, conservative and radical, or positive and liberal, the one side stands for catholic, historical Christianity, the other side stands in a relation of opposition to, or at least of criticism of the historical position of the Church. Between these two there is an irrepressible conflict. It is a conflict that is no longer confined to the professor's classroom, but it has entered the pulpit, and through the press engages the attention of everybody. It is seriously affecting the cause of religion and presents issues which no intelligent Christian can avoid.

It is a mistake to suppose that those who belong to the old

school are mere repristinationists, loving the old merely because it is old, men who have placed an interdict on thought, and who look upon progress as a crime. It was a member of the old school, Professor von Hofmann of the University of Erlangen, who first gave expression to the apothegm: "The old ideas in new forms." Nor are the members of the new school all of them infidels who deserve to be burned at the stake. Many of them are making important contributions to the discovery of truth and to the advancement of the Kingdom. Even if their teaching should prove to be tares, the Lord commanded: "Let both grow together until the harvest."

There are those who maintain that there are no real differences between the two schools, but that they are only the two necessary poles of the intellectual magnet. I shall not try to discuss the underlying philosophical distinctions, but will endeavor to point out some of the chief differences as they ap-

pear on the surface to an ordinary observer.

In Christianity there are two factors, the divine and the human. In the course of history sometimes one factor predominates in the minds of men, sometimes the other. In a healthy development neither can be ignored. The danger is when men go to an extreme in either direction. Nevertheless, Christianity is essentially a Divine revelation. It is a religion therefore of authority. Those who regard this fact alone are in danger of ignoring the human factor and of crushing the freedom of the will. Those who set aside this authority and make their own experience the court of ultimate appeal, are constructing a religion in which God is reduced to the vanishing point. To such the Bible is a book like any other book, and this world is the only world with which at present we need have any concern.

Now one school place the emphasis on the Divine factor. They believe in the main what the Church has believed for nineteen centuries. They have no apologies to make for the Apostles' Creed. Christ is God and the Bible is God's Book. The other side place the emphasis on the human factor. They are not bound by any objective authority but only by that of

experience, their own or that of the Church. The question is not "Who is Christ?" But "What is Christ to me?" Some of them concede the value of the New Testament, as a record of experience, but for no other reason. Many of them look upon it as did Thomas Beecher, who once preached from the title page, which he read for his text: "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," and then turning over the leaves, he continued: "four biographies, a book of travels, a bundle of letters and a dream."

The treatment of this subject is difficult because we no longer have a court of appeal. There is no final authority. Evolution has done away with revelation. With the Roman conception of the Church as chiefly an institution, Protestants from the beginning had no sympathy, and they repudiated the authority of the Church in the Roman sense of the word. But we still had the Bible. Yet now the Bible has gone. finally, truth itself has gone, for, as professor Peabody has shown in his Harvard Lectures, "there is no absolute truth, all is relative to persons and times." Such views have brought about a condition of unrest in religion. Even the pulpit in many cases gives an uncertain sound, and where such is the case it loses its power over the men of our times. With all the wide extension of Protestant Christianity displayed in statistical computations, great masses of people in city and country, deny the power of Christianity as a practical rule of life. With all our wealth of culture in colleges and universities, and with the vast influence of the public school, religion does not take that dominant place in education which its relation to the highest life would seem to require.

Over against the uncertainties of the new school I propose to set forth in a plain form, from the standpoint of an ordinary Christian, a view of the Scriptures which is held in churches that have not yet been swept away by the liberal tide, a faith which still remains the practical basis of their teaching and life, just as if the old order had not changed. My theme is: The Word of God is the means of Grace.

1. Why do we believe this?

Assuming that we are Christians, we begin by accepting Christ as the final authority in religion. "He that seeth me," said Christ, "seeth the Father." There are those who accept Him conditionally. If he meant so-and-so, they will accept Him. Otherwise not. From such we shall have to part company. Let them see to it how they can get along without Christ, with only their "value-judgments" to guide them in their science of God.

This is Weiss' summary of the teaching of Christ on the subject of the Word of God.\* Weiss is almost a liberal and hence may be accepted without prejudice.

Whatever Jesus accomplished in His earthly life in His disciples was accomplished through giving them the Word of God. "I have given them thy word," John 17: 14. In this word was contained the supreme Divine revelation which should bring to the people the promised salvation. This word is the seed of the kingdom, Luke 8: 11. It was only necessary that the disciples should keep this word, John 17:6. That His words should abide in them, John 15:7, and have free course in them, 8: 37. Or that they should abide in His word, 8: 31, i. e., continue to immerse themselves in it and thus experience its The effect would be that they would recognize Him as the one sent for their salvation and would believe in Him, 17:8. Then they would know that in Him God Himself had come to them and loved them as a Father because they believed in Him whom they loved as One in whose mission God had revealed to them His supreme love, 16: 27f. This revelation would bring to pass in them the new life through which they would be His children indeed, i. e., would be like Him, Matthew 5: 45, and so fulfill the will of God even as He at all times tulfilled it. In this sense it would be true, John 8: 31f, that the truth acquired from His Word, consisting in the supreme revelation of the love of God, would make them free from the servitude of sin. That they would be clean because of the word which He had spoken unto them, 15:2. Hence His word, or the word of God which He spoke unto them, was the specific means of grace through which he effected in His

\* See Religion des Neuen Testaments, & 14.

disciples that He had come to effect, the realization of His ideal in faith and conduct and hence the founding of the kingdom of God."

The following is also from Weiss:

1907]

"The permanence of this means of grace was secured through the appointment of a ministry of the word. The word of the apostolic ministry was itself a lifegiving word, because it was none other than a proclamation of Christ. It thus became a living seed, implanted in the nations producing repentance and faith and bringing forth a new life. The gospel which Paul preached he declared to be the power of God unto salvation, or as he wrote to the Thessalonians: "In truth the word of God." The apostolic message was the Word of God because it was the message of Christ, delivered under the direction of that Spirit which should guide them into all truth. But in the churches themselves, which were founded through this word, there sprang up new fountains of testimony, from them sprang fountains of living water, as Christ had foretold."

Upon this foundation of the teaching of Christ and the Apostolic Church we rest our faith. We believe that God has made Himself known, revealed Himself, in His word. That this is an oral word and a written word, contained especially in the writings of the New Testament. We believe that God continues to reveal Himself in this word, partly because it is an authoritative document, which enables us to experience the original revelation, but chiefly because in it God and Christ are truly present with Divine saving power. We believe that God has established a ministry of this word, through which, as a channel or means of grace, the Holy Spirit enables the believer, through the merits of Christ, to find a gracious God. As a corollary we condemn those who teach that by our own effort and thought and work we attain the Holy Ghost without the external word. As Luther said in his reply to the Heavenly Prophets, "Without the external, God does not give the internal."\*

<sup>\*</sup>Cf. Hollaz: Verbum divinum est doctrina de salute hominis divinitus patefacta in scriptura sacra comprehensa quae gratiam divinam nobis confert.

To understand the real significance of this doctrine we must go back to the incarnation. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us \* \* \* full of grace and truth." We believe that Christ still dwells with His Church, and that we may still behold His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten Son. We agree with the Helvetic Confession that God's word points out the way of salvation, but we hold that it does more, it helps us to walk in it. On this point it must not be forgotten that there is a different spirit prevailing even in the older Protestant Churches. The Churches of the Augsburg Confession hold that the Word of God is in a strict sense a means of grace. Those who derive their heritage from Zurich and Geneva do not look upon the Word of God in the technical sense as a means of grace. They regard it rather as a simple proclamation, a dead letter until the Spirit is conferred. It has a moral efficacy in preparing and stimulating the soul, but the converting and regenerating power is exerted by the Spirit, not through the word, but outside of it, alongside of it and independently of it, and that too not upon all, but only upon the elect. We also believe that the word is a source of knowledge. But it is more than that, it is a creative force, a power of God unto salvation unto all who do not reject it. It is not a dead letter as the Quakers and others of that school would try to make us believe, but it is the Divine channel through which the Spirit gives life.

The Church becomes a partaker of this life not, on the one hand, through a special order of the ministry, which by apostolic appointment is authorized to transmit the Divine grace, nor on the other hand from a fresh baptism of the Holy Ghost, given in answer to importunate prayer. The words which Christ has spoken unto us are spirit and life. It is an incorruptible seed which abideth forever. Through this word we are regenerated into the Divine life. "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me 'through their word.'" \*

<sup>\*</sup>We do not overlook the significance of the sacraments as means of grace. But they derive their efficacy from the word. "Accedit verbum, sacramentum fit," A sacrament is a verbum vesibile.

2. What benefits do we derive from the Word of God as a means of grace?

There are many terms that are used in describing the effect of God's Word on the human heart, but they may all be summed up in these two words, faith and love. "Christ for us" and "Christ in us," tell the whole story of the Christian life. To this at least all Positives will give their assent. Among Liberals, Schleiermacher would place the emphasis on feeling, while Ritschl places it on the will. The Lutheran describes the result of this new life as a mystical union, and he has held on to this thought and expression through all the centuries of Protestant controversy. By this he means that there is a real and substantial relation between God and the believer like that between a father and his child. The believer partakes of the hidden manna, and he bears a name which no man knows but him who receives it.

But not only is the beginning of the Christian life brought about by the word, its continuance and completion through all the struggles and reverses of a changeful life are assured *only through the word*. In the word dwells the spirit, in the word dwells and operates the living God.

Christian assurance is likewise the normal gift of the word, not an ecstatic condition of some highly-favored, exceptional Christians, but the plain, every-day possession of the simple believer.

Hence, says Martensen, "the Church of Christ is not simply a realm of invisible, spiritual forces, a world of mystical inwardness, it is a kingdom of God among men, with whom Christ has a present relation through the word which He gives them." This is the teaching of Christ, and this teaching the experience of the Church through all the ages has confirmed.

The question of benefits or profit is very old. Once upon a time Peter said to the Master: "Lo we have left all, and have tollowed thee," suggesting the question as to the reward they might expect. On this question as to what religion does for us, a marked distinction may be observed between the old and the new schools. Both are agreed in giving this answer: "It

introduces us into the Kingdom of God." But when they come to define the Kingdom, there is a great difference. erals have a great deal to say about this world. They seem to glory in their agnosticism as to the future state. They have a psychological heaven. They have peace. They have a moral elevation that lifts them above this world. Others find their heaven in the improvement of social conditions, in getting better schools, better sewers, better politics. A preacher of this school will not find it difficult to reap the approbation of a wordly-minded congregation by demonstrating how their heaven is so much better than the heaven of the old-fashioned Christians, because it takes account of their present wants and necessities. Their theme is: "Be happy and you will be good." Well, Christ did not overlook the temporal wants of men. He said to Peter that they should have a hundredfold in this life, but the glory of His promise lay in the words, "in the world to come, eternal life.

We may concede that there have been times when Christian thought has not taken sufficient account of present world needs and opportunities. The hermit withdrew to the desert, and the monk to the cloister, in order that they might not be contaminated by the world. But in the end, practical religion, as illustrated best in the life of Christ and His apostles, brought the Church back again to her legitimate calling as a servant of men, and that too in earthly and secular relations, for Jesus' sake.

The old-fashioned believer also tries to make the most of this life. Nevertheless he has a larger vision than this narrow sphere affords, for he knows that the things which are seen are temporal but the things which are not seen are eternal. Hence in spite of scoffers, he sings:

Jerusalem the golden, with milk and honey blest!
Beneath thy contemplation sink heart and voice opprest:
I know not, oh, I know not, what joys await me there,
What radiancy of glory, what light beyond compare.

- 3. What use can we make of this doctrine?
- I. For the edification of the Church.

Eternal life, the Divine life here, and the life hereafter, is the

gift of God, through the word and only through the word. God cannot be comprehended except through the word. For this reason the Bible is often called the Gospel. And preaching is called the Gospel, because it contains, or should contain, the message which Christ gave.

The reading of the word of God has its undisputed place at the family altar. Following the practice of the Church of all ages, our own Church has made large provision for the reading of Scripture in her liturgical services. Possibly in the course of liturgical enrichment a way may sometime be found to add to the pericopes of the morning service a lesson from the Old Testament prophets. But certainly in the other services, whether of matins or of vespers there is a large opportunity for an edifying use of not only one lesson but of two or three.

But the word of God is not only the Bible, the printed record of the past, it is also the preached message of Christ's ministers. This was true of the apostles. It was true of their successors. It is true today. Whether the sermon take the form of an explanation of the word, or that of witnessing, or of catechisation, or of the proclamation of a message, a Christian sermon in its ideal character is the expression or proclamation of the word of God.

While our Church is a liturgical Church, and has gratefully preserved in her order of worship the essential features of the liturgy of the ancient and historical Churches, she has given the greatest emphasis to the place of preaching. It may be worth while also at this point to call attention to that conception of preaching which is held in our Church, which is not found everywhere in the Protestant communions, namely that of a celebration (Feier). We know what the Roman Catholic means when he speaks of the celebration of the Mass. He believes in the real presence. In our services we have learned to distinguish between the sacrificial and the sacramental elements of worship. The hymns and prayers are sacrificial. The reading of the word and the Holy Communion are sacramental. The sermon is both. It is on the one hand sacrificial, in so far as it is a testimony of personal faith. But its chief

importance lies in its sacramental character. The preacher handles divine mysteries. The word which he preaches is not mere instruction nor exhortation. It is a communication. As Martensen says: "In the true service Christ Himself is the preacher. It is not a sermon about Christ, but it is the word of Christ. If the Christian sermon were simply a continuous effort to keep His memory green, all our efforts would fail. In accordance with a universal law of history his image would fade away. But now where the word of God and a believing Church meet, the Lord Himself is present in the power of the Holy Ghost."

These considerations emphasize the importance of that oldfashioned Christian custom of going to church. Too often the Sunday newspaper and the automobile enter into successful competition with the Church. It is our duty in view of the Divine character of the Church service earnestly to protest against this downward tendency. As Luther says in his explanation of the 3d Commandment: "We should fear and love God, and not despise preaching and His Word, but keep it holy and gladly hear and learn it." On the other hand it is incumbent upon the preacher to recognize the sacredness of his callings and not to yield to the temptation to win public attention by means of some sensational topic or to secure interest by the meretricious attractions of a worldly discourse. Preachers have a great diversity of gifts which they are bound to use in the service of the Master, but let it be understood that what all have in common, the climax of their utterance, the gist of their message is the word of God.

The efficacy of the sermon will be promoted also by keeping in mind the distinct functions of the word, the Law and the Gospel. The Law is the Divine norm for human life. The Gospel is a message of forgiveness for Christ's sake freely conferred through faith.

The Law demands, the Gospel gives. The Law kills, the Gospel makes alive. The Law shows us our sin, the Gospel shows us our Saviour. The Law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. The dogmaticians point out various uses of the

law, but an allusion to one will serve my purpose. The law is a mirror in which we behold ourselves as unclean and condemned. "I had not known sin, except through the law." The Gospel points us to the tountain of cleansing, to the way of escape from condemnation. The law is for the unconverted man, not for the sake of inducing him to reach an ethical standard which he never can reach, but to convince him of the hopelessness of his condition. But the law is also for the converted man, in order that he may learn the significance of his baptism, "that the old man should, by daily sorrow and repentance be drowned and die, and again a new man daily come forth and arise, who shall live before God in righteousness and purity for ever."

No sermon is complete without the Law, and no sermon is complete without the Gospel. Whatever the text or theme, it should never fail to carry the message of John 3: 16.

If it be true that the Protestant pulpit has in any respect lost its grip upon the public mind, it is because the emphasis has been placed upon the human side of its work, rather than upon the preached word as a channel of divine grace.

It is a maxim among the Roman Catholics that there never can be too many ministers. We seem to have reversed this among us Protestants. Far be it from me to exalt the ministry as an order superior to that of the so-called laity. We would have stronger Churches and a more wholesome Christianity if for a time we should exalt that universal priesthood which our Church in theory faithfully teaches. There is a ministry which every one of us is called upon to exercise and which we cannot delegate to him who stands upon the pulpit. We need a fuller recognition of the claims of this universal ministry, and of the sanctity of the work in the ordinary lives of men.

I am aware too of the potent appeals which the secular pursuits of our age put forth to our young men, and to the prizes which it offers to those who respond. Nor can I conceal the fact that in too many cases a minister's years of service are far more limited than those of men in other professions. And yet

if there is a dead line in his career, which I do not believe, it has been drawn by himself rather than by others.

If it is true that there is a Christ, a real Christ, and not an imaginary Christ, whose resurrection is a matter of indifference so long as we "value-judge" His resurrection, if His word is that which He declared it to be, what a dignity it gives to the calling of the minister of the word.

They tell us that the minister is no longer the power in society that he once was, that whatever influence he has is owing to something that he is besides being a minister. Even if this were true, who cares for power if he can have the privilege of service. The follower of Christ is not an imperator, but a minister, a servant of the meek and lowly One. And yet I do not believe a word of the claim as to the declining power of the ministry. With no sacerdotal conceptions of the ministry, I believe that since he is the mouthpiece and messenger of supernatural, of Divine things, he still holds a place of unquestioned influence and power. The world can only be saved by faith, and faith, as Luther's version has it, cometh from preaching, and preaching through the word of God.

2. For evangelisation. By this we generally mean some special effort to reach those who have been estranged from the Christian Church, or for other reasons are outside of her regular ministry. No Church can claim to represent the spirit of Christ that does not realize the obligation of such a service. But in rendering such a service, we must be careful not to discredit the ordinary means of grace. The ordinary preacher is an evangelist, and the sermon which he preaches is or ought to be an evangel. If the preacher preaches the word of God, his message will be effective in convicting, converting and edifying the hearers. If he does not preach the word of God, if from the pulpit and on Sundays, he preaches on other topics, he has mistaken his calling, and then an evangelist is needed, but a permanent, not a peripatetic evangelist. But with a Scriptural conception of the Word of God as means of grace, we ought to expect results from the plain preacher, at the ordinary service, and in the use of every sermon.

I venture also to inquire whether the professional evangelist, in so far as he is differentiated from the regular minister, is evangelical. The reason for his presence, the secret of his power, lies not in the word which he preaches, but in the hypnotic influence of his personality, or in the peculiar charm of his vocabulary and utterance. He says "Mesopotamia," and the people are melted with emotion. From his treasury of things new and old he brings forth a pleasing incident, and ripples of delight roll over the congregation. He narrates a pathetic story, the people are melted to tears and scores are converted. But in reference to all such conversions it is fair to ask from what have they been converted, and to what have they been converted.

From what has been said it must be clear that the word is the chief instrument in evangelization. This would seem to require no further proof. But is it not true that the keynote of much of the evangelistic preaching of the age is something else than the word. The inquirer is urged to pray, to wrestle with God in prayer, to say "I will not let thee go until I receive a blessing." In its place all this is good advice. But it is not the Gospel. There is a better message than: "Come to Jesus," it is: "Jesus has come to you." His finished work is yours if you will only accept it. His blood cleanses from all sin, it cleanses you from your sin.

Nor is it, I opine, a healthful message to emphasize the importance of a new baptism of the Holy Spirit. "The word is night hee, in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is the word of faith, which we preach."

In this connection it is in place to speak of that word of God which passes from the lips to the heart, as the Germans say: "unter vier Augen," under four eyes. It is a great thing to proclaim the Gospel with unction to the listening congregation, or to send it in the printed page aflame with power throughout the land. But some of the most effective and lasting sermons have been like those which Philip preached to the eunuch, God's word to one waiting heart, and he who received it "went on his way rejoicing." Young People's Associations have been an

instrument for good in all that they have done for Christian fellowship and united effort in Christian work, but not the least of their blessings has been the opportunity they have given to pass along the good word of God through the mediation of individual friendship and association:

"I say to thee, do thou repeat To the first man thou mayest meet In lane, highway or open street.

That he, and we, and all men move Under a canopy of love As broad as the blue sky above;

That if we will one Guide obey, The dreariest path, the darkest way, Shall issue out in heavenly day.

And one thing further make him know: That to believe these things are so. That firm faith never to forego.

Despite of all which seems at strife With blessings all, with curses rife, That this is blessing, this is life."

3. Finally for education. Religion and education go hand-in-hand. A nation is strong, not in proportion to its material strength and resources, but in proportion to its ideals. Where there is no vision, the people perish. The Christian religion has always been the mother of education. And in particular may we claim for our Protestant system the honor of having laid deep and broad the foundations of modern education. It is not necessary to prove this position. All who are familiar with the history of education know the dominant part which the Protestant Church, and in an especial sense the Lutheran Church has taken in securing and establishing the educational systems under which modern nations are prospering.

Nevertheless there is reason to fear that an alienation has sprung up which may ultimately lead to a divorce. Our American constitution from the beginning very properly provided for a complete separation of Church and State. Hence it is no part of the State to teach religion. That responsibility is thrown upon the churches. In the early history of our coun-

try, with a homogeneous population, churches and schools worked harmoniously toward common ends. But a time has come when, with a large percentage of our people adherents of a different religion from the majority, and members of alien races, the problem has become pressing and difficult. eminent educator and publicist, Andrew D. White, has recently lifted a warning voice in view of the perils that threaten our country. He believes that the remedy is to be found in education. And although he has hitherto belonged to the disdinctly liberal thinkers, he emphasizes the necessity of religion in education. The solution which he offers, the introduction of religious instruction in the school, may be open to discussion. The solution of the question through the voluntary Sunday School or the impracticable parochial school does not seem to have proved adequate. At all events there is thrown upon the Churches and the Christian schools of our country a problem of the highest importance, of the deepest significance.

Toward the close of the Sixteenth Century Protestantism had obtained a strong hold on the people of Austria especially among the higher classes. In the reaction that took place in the seventeenth century, the emperor proposed to expel them from the country. A far-seeing member of his council advised him not to do so, but instead to order the suppression of their schools. The emperor followed his advice and not many years passed by before there were no more Protestants in Austria.

Modern History was ushered in by two great movements which were almost contemporaneous. The one was the Reformation, the other was the Renaissance. The latter appealed to men's conception of all that is beautiful in human life. The former appealed to the supreme authority and universal application of the word. There can be no doubt as to which of these has made the most important contribution to the history of civilization.

I plead for a clearer recognition of this historical position of our Church, this fundamental position of safety and progress, the acceptance of the word of God in worship, in ethics, in culture as the channel of Divine grace and inspiration. Amid all the fleeting and uncertain theories of a Sadducaic age, this is the impregnable rock upon which we may stand. Let us therefore reverently unite in that ancient prayer of the servants of God: "Lord, send thy light and thy truth that they may guide us to thy heavenly hill."

### ARTICLE II.

"CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY" BY DR. VALENTINE.\*

By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.

The publication of Valentine's Christian Theology marks an era in American Lutheran theological literature. It is the first, complete, original treatise on Systematic Theology from a Lutheran standpoint that has appeared in the English language. In saying this we do not forget the very useful Popular Theology of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, which first appeared in 1834, and which passed through at least nine editions. But the book was not meant to be a thorough and systematic discussion. Nor do we desire to ignore the very excellent Summary of the Christian Faith by Dr. Jacobs, published about a year ago. If we have properly understood its design, it is a concise reproduction in the form of questions and answers of "results," "drawn largely from our Confessions and Luther and our own theologians." It is adapted to the class-room, rather than for the general reader. Nor would we underestimate the various valuable contributions on doctrine made by the brilliant Krauth, the versatile Seiss, the saintly Sprecher, and many other Lutheran authors who have enriched our literature. Nevertheless, we affirm that Dr. Valentine's last work is the first original contribution of a Lutheran author which takes rank with similar productions by American Calvinistic writers.

It may seem strange that the Lutheran Church in America

<sup>\*</sup> Christian Theology, By Milton Valentine, D.D., L.L.D., Late Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Vol. I. pp. 476; Vol. II. pp. 454. Cloth 8 mo. \$2.50 each. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

has been so slow in producing works on Systematic Theology: and yet the reason is apparent to those who understand our history. Having its roots in Germany, our Church at first naturally received its theology from the rich treasures of the Fatherland. As the Church became Anglicized, translations of dogmatic works were used. Professors in the Seminaries also gave original lectures; but these were not published for lack of time to prepare them for the press, or for want of means, or because of the theological unrest in the Church. stances have changed. The Lutheran Church in America is coming into her true heritage. Scholarship is being developed. A period of repose, after a generation of controversy, has been reached; and we may look for greater productiveness in the line of constructive theology.

We, therefore, hail Dr. Valentine's Theology with sincere satisfaction, not as the final word on a great theme, but as the precursor of works, which shall reproduce and emphasize the conservative theology of the Protestant Reformation in the thought and language of the day.

A melancholy interest is attached to these volumes, inasmuch as the hand that toiled so patiently upon them was palsied by death before the work was fully completed. This accounts for some omissions, which however do not affect the integrity of The Preface states that "a chapter on the Authority the work. of the Scriptures" was contemplated, but not written. We have no doubt also that the subject of Angels was not treated because the author was borne on angels' wings before he had time to tell of their ministry to the saints on earth.

It is fortunate that these volumes were brought out under the competent and sympathetic supervision of Dr. Valentine's son, the Editor of The Lutheran Observer. As the author was wont to produce "clean copy" in a clear bold hand, the task of the editor was comparatively light. The printing and general make-up of the volumes reflect great credit upon the publishers.

The author brought to his task the equipment of that indefatigable industry, which is unappalled by the difficulties of a

subject. Hence, he passed no hard points by, and gave his theme thoroughness of treatment. He was possessed of a keen. philosophical mind which penetrated to the heart of things, discerning the truth almost as by intuition and exposing the weakness and sophistry of error. Moreover, he was a ripe scholar, having spent forty years as a teacher in College and Seminary, where his enthusiasm won the admiration of his pupils. His touch with young men kept him young in feeling and sympathy, so that he lived in the present rather than in the past. This made him more than an echo of the voices of past centuries, and his theology more than a repetition of crystalized formulas.

Two things particularly fitted him for his latest work. The one was his living faith; the other his preliminary studies. It was apparent from his utterances and character that he lived in close fell wiship with our Lord. His life was spent in unswerving loyalty to Christ. In none of his writings does he cast a shadow of doubt upon the fundamentals of the faith of the Church. To the end, though he had not been a pastor for more than a generation, his occasional sermons were full of the thought of Christ, the friend and Savior of poor sinners, and of yearning for the salvation of souls. We emphasize this point, for a theologian without "heart" is no theologian all all. Pectus facit theologum.

Dr. Valentine's long study of psychology, of philosophy, of ethics, and of the evidences of Christianity, during the term of his presidency of Pennsylvania College, was a splendid training for his theological career. His books on Natural Theism and Theoretical Ethics, together with his sermons and numerous articles in The Lutheran Quarterly, find their final coronation in his Christian Theology. To him theology was "the queen of the sciences."

His last work is characterized by the high literary quality which is familiar to the readers of the QUARTERLY. His productions are distinguished for clearness of thought and for felicity of expression. His diction is polished and dignified, as befits his subject. There is an easy flow of language, like that

of the waters of a deep, broad, majestic river. We suspect that the average layman may sometimes be carried beyond his depths in reading these volumes, but they are not beyond the average pastor, nor the thoughtful, well-read layman. They should find their way into the library of every Lutheran minister.

The general character of Dr. Valentine's Christian Theology is determined by the history of its production. It is not the fruit of passion for authorship. If the author had been a mere bookmaker he might have published these volumes years ago. They are the product of long and careful study and revision. They embody the mature results of investigation and discussion by a living teacher, who was not only in contact with bright, inquiring young men in the class-room, but also in touch with the thought of the day. The motive that prompted the final preparation of the work was the conscientious impulse of a wise and good man to leave his written testimony concerning the great truths of our holy religion, as they presented themselves to his mind and conscience.

Moreover, the aim is altogether practical. Though scientific in form and cogent in statement, challenging close attention and criticism, the supreme end of these volumes is to equip men to understand and to preach the truth as it is in Jesus. The evident purpose is to set forth the great facts of our faith in such a manner that they might stand out in proper relation and symmetry, that the student might be fitted to use them in all confidence in his ministry.

Dr. Valentine wrote from a decidedly conservative standpoint. By this we mean that he held to the integrity and historicity of the Bible. Well acquainted with the assaults of the
negative higher criticism, he saw no good reason to depart from
the faith of the fathers. While he rejected the idea of a mere
verbal and mechanical inspiration, he received the Bible as
God's Word revealed to man. His *Theology* is, therefore, preeminently Biblical. His final appeal is to the Scriptures. Upon
matters transcending reason he always rests the case upon
that which God has revealed. There is, however, no forced

use of "proof-texts." Disputed and irrelevant passages are not pressed into service to bolster up a doctrine.

The Scriptures always furnish the basis for every doctrine which Dr. Valentine defends. He does not accept it or reject it, because it is, or is not set forth in the Creed. The Word, interpreted in the light of scholarship, history and experience, is the norm of his teaching. And yet his *Theology* is Systematic, and not technically Biblical. Starting with the results of Biblical Theology, he accepts the legitimate development of doctrine as it has been formed through the centuries of Church life and experience, wrought by the Holy Spirit.

As a conservative theologian, Dr. Valentine accepted the great Ecumenical Creeds, not because they are the authoritative utterances of the Church, but because he believed them to be the expression of fundamental truth. He accepted, therefore, with all his heart the cardinal doctrines of the Trinity of the Godhead, the absolute divinity of Christ, together with the virgin-birth, the depravity of the race through sin, the atonement by the blood of the cross, the need of the regeneration of the heart by the Holy Spirit, and eternal retribution upon the basis of the life on earth.

These doctrines are set forth and defended with rare logical skill. While the treatment is not strictly original, it is always independent. Originality is well nigh impossible in a field so often traversed; but freshness is evident on nearly every page.

Dr. Valentine's attitude may be best understood by looking at the treatment of some one subject. We take at a venture the doctrine of the Atonement. "The New Testament teaching is that the atonement needed was such a work by Christ as should, on the one hand, reconcile divine forgiveness of sin with the unlowered supremacy of holiness and righteousness; and on the other reconcile estranged man to God. \* It was in its transcendent realities and bearings, to make such satisfaction to God's holiness and righteousness as to render it possible for God consistently to act in pardoning love to penitent guilt. \* In its humanward bearing, the end sought through the atonement, as distinctly indicated by the supreme

manifestation and appeal of redeeming love, is to overthrow man's alienation and inspire trust, love, and obedience. \* \* These two ends are inseparable in a full Scriptural view of the atonement. \* \* \* The decisive point which divides all false or partial theories from the true and full conception is right here—in this denial or omission of the Godward side. Whatever may be the philosophy of the atonement, any account which makes such denial, thereby takes its position outside of the requirements of Scripture or orthodoxy." "The Scripture teaching requires, as the very core of the atonement, the reality of a vicarious satisfaction of the divine justice and holiness against the guilt of sin. God could not compromise His righteousness by simply passing over its unspeakable ill-desert."

From the above quotations it is obvious that Dr. Valentine accepts the so-called Satisfaction Theory of the Atonement as propounded by Anselm, and yet not without some qualifying statements. We are well aware that much recent theology seeks to discredit this view, substituting for it the so-called Moral Influence theory, in which properly speaking there is no atonement at all. Our author restates the orthodox position clearly and strongly. It is needless to set forth his attitude on other cardinal doctrines; for they are all brought out in the same masterly way.

The order of treatment is that which is usually followed. The Introduction treats of the subject matter of theology, of its sources, and of Revelation in particular. Then comes the consideration of the "doctrine of God," of Man, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the Word, the Sacraments and the Church, and the "Last Things." Technically stated, these divisions are Theology, Anthropology, Christology or Soteriology, Pneumatology, and Eschatology.

This order has sometimes been derided as hackneyed. But it is the treatment that often merits reproach rather than the order; for the latter is logical, and practically the historical order in the development of doctrine. We believe that any rearrangement would conflict with the natural course of thought.

The distinctive character of a theological system is determined chiefly by its "method," or point of view. The central doctrine shapes the entire conception. The relation and comparative importance of all its parts are affected by the central idea. The two chief methods prevailing in theology are the Trinitarian and the Christo-centric. The former characterizes Calvinistic or Reformed Theology, which makes the divine Sovereignty, with all its implications, the starting point. The latter or Christo-centric method dominates Lutheran Theology. It seeks to approach God as he approaches us, that is, through Christ. It regards God as a loving Father, who would save all men, rather than as a stern Sovereign, who fixes the destiny of all men by immutable decree.

In following the Christo-centric method, Dr. Valentine is a Lutheran rather than a Reformed theologian. This does not mean that our author is sectarian, and that he cannot see truth in other systems, or that he would deny fellowship with the saints wherever found. The title Caristian Theology is not presumptous, for all Christians may find much to endorse in these volumes. Nevertheless, it must in consistency with itself part company with any system which teaches a limited atonement. or eternal damnation regardless of foreseen character. It distinctly repudiates Calvinism.

This *Theology* is Christian and Protestant, over against Romanism, with its false conception of the sacraments, of repentance, of the Scriptures, and of the ministry. It of course, utterly rejects the dogmas of infallability, of Purgatory, of the intercession of saints, and other errors.

Dr. Valentine also stands for infant membership in the Church through baptism, as over against the Baptists, who deny the sacred rite and sacrament to the little ones, of whom the Savior says, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." He shows the unity of the Church under both dispensations, and proves that the sign of the covenant is baptism under the new dispensation, as circumcision was under the old.

But after all, is Dr. Valentine's *Theology* distinctly Lutheran? The answer to this will depend upon one's conception of Luth-

eranism. If this is to be determined by a rigid adherence to all the "symbolical books," received in their "only true, native and original sense," then we are sure that this *Theology* is not strictly Lutheran. If opinions expressed casually by the Reformers or held by some dogmaticians on such matters as child-faith are to be normative, then again this *Theology* is not strictly Lutheran.

We deny, however, that these things are proper criteria of Lutheranism. The two great determinative principles of the Lutheran Reformation are loyalty to the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the acceptance of the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ. These principles, the *formal* and the *material*, dominate Dr. Valentine's work and give it the stamp of Lutheran. The doctrine of justification by faith, in its relation to Christology and human salvation, is everywhere emphasized. The great prominence of this doctrine is the true and distinguishing mark of our theology. As has often been shown, it occupies a peculiar and determinative place in Lutheran theology, because it magnifies the Person of Christ.

And this leads us to Dr. Valentine's conception of faith and free-will. "Faith," says he, "is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, through the Word. It is not the product of our own natural ability. By reason of the depravity of human nature, its alienation from God and its bondage in sin, it cannot of itself exercise saving faith. The will is enslaved to indwelling corruption." "But by quickening, prevenient grace, a free assent or acceptance of Christ is made possible. Men are not purely passive in conversion. They are measurably active in the incipient elements of faith-in "knowledge" or understanding of the truth, and in "assent" as formal belief of the truth, under the Spirit's call. And in "confidence," the selfsurrender of sincere trust, the activity continues, under the progressive awakening and quickening. The whole movement is one in which God comes with enabling grace for man's acceptance of the prepared, but not yet actualized salvation. And the "assent" or acceptance is necessarily man's act, not God's-but

man's empowered by God's Spirit of grace. It is an act of the human will. God cannot believe for man; but through the truth made potent by the Holy Spirit, He can make faith possible to the otherwise impotent human will." This, it seems to us, is entirely in accordance with Scripture, with the Augsburg Confession, and with sound reason.

The Christian Theology also follows the Scriptural "order of salvation" in placing justification before regeneration, which order was reversed by Calovius and others in the seventeenth century. This error crept into the Church through the false conception that faith can come alone through regeneration. Luther taught correctly that faith has a two-fold operation: to justify and to renew, the second following the first. Likewise, the "Form of Concord" teaches that "faith lays hold of God's grace in Christ, whereby the person is justified. Then when the person is justified, he is renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit." Faith, awakened and made possible through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Word, underlies all the spiritual processes in the application of redemption. God enables man to believe. When he believes he is justified and his sins forgiven, and he is made a new creature in Christ. der, therefore, logically is justification, regeneration, sanctification. Chronologically these experiences are not necessarily far apart.

In the discussion of the means of grace, Dr. Valentine properly makes the Word primary, as being in itself the power of God unto salvation to the believer, and as constitutive for the sacraments. He thus does not undervalue the latter, but agrees with Luther in assigning to preaching and to teaching the first place in the divine service. The undue exaltation of the sacraments was no doubt one of the fundamental errors which corrupted the Church, and which made the Reformation necessary. Romanism still maintains the false dogma that the grace of justification is conferred only through the sacraments and that they are efficacious without faith, when no obstacle is offered.

It has been asked whether our author accepts the Lutheran

view of the Sacraments. Let us briefly compare his theology with the teachings of the Augsburg Confession: "Concerning baptism our Churches teach, that it is necessary to salvation; that through baptism, the grace of God is offered" (Art. IX). "In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truely present, and are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper" (Art. X).

Dr. Valentine's Theology teaches: "The Sacraments are an ordinary necessity to salvation \* \* But the necessity is not to be understood as absolute, i. e., that the grace of salvation cannot possibly be given apart from them \* \* \* This is certified Scripturally by the instances of the dying thief on the cross, and of Cornelius to whom was given the Holy Spirit with His saving gifts before any sacramental administration. Protestant theological interpretation has consentiently accepted this truth. Luther argues that as Jewish children dying before circumcision were not lost, neither are Christian children dying before baptism" (Vol. II. p. 304).

"The Sacraments are means or bearers of grace to believing recipients. \* \* The creation of them implies their instrumentality for a unique service in conveying the grace of the gospel to our experience. We cannot regard them as mere memorials of events and truths, to form a decorous commemoration in religion, as a fourth of July in patriotism" (p. 297).

"May the child be said to be regenerated by the act of Baptism? We may properly answer, Yes; but only in the sense that the established vital and grace-conveying relation under imputed righteousness and the Holy Spirit, may be said to hold, in its provisions and forces, the final covenanted development" (p. 329). "Are the baptized children to be accounted as believers and members of the Church? Their membership in the visible Church is at once real and complete; and they are accordingly to be numbered as believers, sealed by the sacrament of faith" (p. 331).

Concerning the Lord's Supper, Dr. Valentine says with approval: "The Lutheran view, in general statement, teaches that while the elements, bread and wine, remain unchanged,

they really without figure become the communion of the body and blood of Christ glorified after a supernatural, divine, and heavenly mode of presence, union, and communication to the communicants. It regards the mode of presence as an inscrutable mystery, and only insists on recognition of the supernatural, divine fact as a fact, for our faith" (p. 344).

"Though in the way of a visible, tangible, localized presence, perceptible to the senses, He has in his glorification, ascended and left the world, and is not here in that mode; yet in another mode, glorified, supernatural and divine, by virtue of his eternal Deity, He is, or can be, present with believers everywhere in the completeness of His theanthropic Person" (p. 346).

"When the various definitions and explanations are brought together and correlated, they result in establishing for the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in its essential content and significance, a divinely instituted sacrament for perpetual use in His Church, which, while constituting a memorial of His redemptive suffering, is made also, through a real, special definitive Presence, under His generic omnipresence, a means by which He gives himself to believers as the ever-living Savior, in the fullness of His provided grace and saving power" (p. 358).

"As to the oft-asserted reception of the grace of the Sacrament by unbelievers as well as believers, this is simply an associated feature of the oral manducation which cannot be proved an essential part of our confessional theology, and must be modified into accord with the ruling principles and order of grace. Of course, the formal sacrament is received by unbelievers as well as believers. The recipients faith does not constitute it or determine what is present or offered. A real faith of the heart, however, is necessary to receive what is divinely present for reception. And the Form of Concord itself makes easy the necessary adjustment to the real truth when it declares that unbelieving communicants ' repel Christ as the Savior from themselves.' They do not receive Him-either as to His divine or human nature, or His offered grace. But he whose faith accepts Christ receives all grace in and with Him" (p. 359).

In short, the unworthy communicant receives Christ in the Sacrament in the same way as he does when he hears the Gospel—that is, he receives Him formally and nominally, but actually rejects Him.

We have quoted Dr. Valentine at some length that the reader might decide for himself. For ourselves we heartily approve the general attitude taken. We are aware, indeed, that there are and have been extreme, ultra teachings in the Lutheran Church concerning the Sacraments; but we do not regard these as generic and normative. Dr. Valentine has kept within the sale bounds of our great Confession, of reason, and of the Scriptures.

Several years ago a prominent pastor and author, in a branch of our Church other than the General Synod, expressed the hope that some one might soon arise and translate Lutheran theology into the language and thought of today. We believe that Dr. Valentine has done this in very large measure. He has, at least for our English-speaking American Lutheran Church, presented a system of theology which conserves the faith of our Church in the light of modern, evangelical thinking.

Christian Theology will commend itself to the candid reader of whatever denomination he may be. He will find in it a strong defence of our common faith.

### ARTICLE III.

### LUTHERAN GERMANY AND THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

By Professor John O. Evjen, Ph.D.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 94).

v. BADEN (Grand-Duchy).

The area of Baden is 5,823 sq. miles. It has a population of 1,867,944, of which 704,058 are Protestants. Its established Protestant Church is the United Evangelical. The Union was established as early as 1821, the Lutherans at that time numbering 261,265, the Reformed 67,170. To-day, however, it cannot be said that the Lutheran type is characteristic of the Union in Baden, as it is, for instance, in the Prussian Union.\* Baden is fusion unionistic, the Prussian Union is a federation.† Almost everywhere in the Prussian Union ‡ Luther's Catechism

\*Th. Kaftan in "Vier Kapitel von der Landeskirche," p. 21: Die unierte Kirche Preussens hat sehr vorwiegend lutherischen Typus,

†There are at least three different kinds of Union: (a) an absorption of the one denomination by the other; (b) a fusion of the two into one, in which each gives up its peculiarities; (c) a federation by which each remains distinct in creed and customs, but admits the ministers of the other denominations into its pulpits and their communicants to its communion. The first decree relative to the Prussian Union (1817) stood for federation; the next (1830), ordering the introduction of a common liturgy, made the Union a fusion; the third (1834) a federation. (See The LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1907, p. 72).

Dr. Good is right in his statement that, "as a class, the Lutherans generally understood the Union to mean fusion, while the Reformed generally that it meant federation. This difference will explain some of the acts of the Lutherans, which seem arbitrary." The greater part of Lutheran America still persists in misunderstanding "federation," confounding it with fusion. Hence so many absurd condemnations of "Union" and "Unionism," and so much dread of German theology as being "Unionistic" where it is not rationalistic.

† The provinces of Rhine and Westphalia are the most notable exceptions, favoring the Consensus Catechisms. In Rhine it is used by 179 congregations, twenty-seven use other Catechisms (Cohrs, "Katechismen" in P. RE. X. 145 f). In determining the Confessional status of a state, Luther's Catechism is a safe criterion. "Among the Confessional writings," as Th. Kaftan says (Vier Kapitel \* \* \* , p. 44), "there is one

is the officially recognized text-book over against the Heidelberg or the Consensus Catechisms (i. e., Reformed or Reformed-Lutheran). The official Catechism of the United Church of Baden is the Consensus, not Luther's.

When we here treat Baden at some length, we do so, not because its Lutheranism warrants this, but because it is quite typical of those territories along the Rhine that introduced the Union.

Baden was originally a Lutheran territory (Baden-Durlach), which at the accession of Margrave Charles Frederick, about the middle of the eighteenth century, had an area of 600 sq. miles, and a population of 100,000. But in 1811 the Margrave, after ruling sixty-two years, could witness that his territory was ten times as large as at the beginning of his reign. Baden-Baden (Catholic) had been added to it in 1771. In 1803 it acquired that portion of the Palatinate lying on the right bank of the Rhine (Heidelberg, Mannheim), also the portion of the bishoprics of Constance, Basle, Strassburg, Speyer, on the right bank of the Rhine, and many ecclesiastical foundations and imperial cities. All this, together with the title of Electorate was indemnification for losses suffered in the coalition war. Much of this unmerited increase of territory was due to France and to Russia, to whose Emperor the ruler of Baden was dynastically related. The area of Baden was now twothirds of what it became in 1811. In this year it received about 2000 square miles, and the title of Grand-Duchy. It was the direct work of Napoleon-his reward to Baden for serving him in the Confederation of the Rhine. This terri-

which arose from the need of declaring what man should know about religion in order to live and die as a Christian: Luther's Catechism. There is, accordingly, none of the other Confessions so independent of Zeitcharakter as Luther's Catechism; it expresses the religious side of the Confession rather than the theological. It is through this symbol that the Confession still remains a living force in the laity. From the standpoint of the Church people, the Catechism is the symbolical book." To substantiate this, we might add the discrimination made by Kawerau, in claiming that among the excellencies of Luther's Catechism are: (1) it does not furnish a connected system of doctrines, is no child's dogmatics; (2) it carefully avoids the scholastic language of the theologian; (3) it employs no definitions and no schematism (P. RE, X. 135).

torial growth of a petty state, \* with an insignificant history, accounts, on the one hand, for the Roman Catholic ascendency 60.6 per cent., and, on the other, for the strength of the Reformed type in the Union, even if the Reformed were numerically weaker than the Lutherans. A strong Reformed influence would naturally be exerted by the Palatinate, which had both history and prestige. Its share in the Thirty Years War, in defence of Protestantism; its possession of a famous centre of culture like the Heidelberg University; and its initiative in giving to the religious world a Catechism which was to rival Luther's, were determinative factors for prestige and influence. Moreover, the Count Palatine had been one of the seven mem-

\*How difficult a matter the problem of Confessional subscription was in Germany may be imagined, when one considers that the Peace of Westphalia was the triumph of the petty states. 300 (more correctly 400, the exact number has never been ascertained) principalities and little republics now dotted the map of Germany. They claimed and obtained for themselves the right to coin money, raise armies, close alliances, besides the privilege of being consulted in matters of general government. 1500 imperial knights obtained jurisdiction over their subjects. "Dozens of states were able to boast of not more than seven or eight miles apiece, yet their rulers invariably spoke of themselves as 'we, so and'so, by the grace of God, etc.' \* \* \* The abbess of Gutenzell was down in the Reichsmatrikel for one-third of a horseman and three and one-third foot soldiers; the barony of Sickingen for two-thirds of a horseman and five and one-third foot. The burgraviate of Reineck could boast of one castle, twelve poor subjects, one Jew, and a couple of farms and mill wheels."

The touch of Napoleon's iron hand was required to smooth these wrinkles in the Physiognomy of Germany. A beginning was made in 1803 by the Imperial Deputation who acted according to a plan of indemnification established by France and Russia. It annihilated 112 German states, in addition to 97 ceded to France, and divided up 50,000 square miles of territory with more than 3,000,000 inhabitants. It was the scheme of France to compensate with ecclesiastical lands on the right bank of the Rhine those princes who had lost possessions on the left. Upon Württemberg, Baden, Hesse, and Bavaria Napoleon heaped all the benefits of his power in order to have a "Third Germany" to make use of against Prussia and Austria. For that reason Baden was given in compensation for her lost territory ten times as much as was her due. The Napoleonic "state-making" necessarily affected also the Confessional status of the maimed or indemnified territories. This was felt as soon as the spell of Rationalism gave way to saner reflection. (See Häusser, Deutsche Geschichte, (1869), I. 4f., 65 f.; Treitschke, Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert, (1897), II. 354 f.; Henderson, A Short History of Germany, (1902), II. 219f., 247.

bers of the Electoral College, which had for centuries been choosing the Emperors and playing a part in German history second to them. To this may be added the aggressive spirit of the Reformed, which has always and everywhere duly exerted itself, not seldom at the expense of the Lutherans.

The people of Baden now beheld three Confessions and a vast number of weak and puny chance-territories huddled together within disproportionate boundaries. How should they adjust themselves to the new order of things, disciples, as they were, of the New Illumination which saw in history nothing but the sum of arbitrary actions? For, a long time after the other German states had awakened from that stupor which makes man so callous to history, Baden was rocking in the cradle of ratio, forgetful of reality. Thus, it became, as Treitschke says, the natural home of a liberalism which with unfailing promptness adjusted political as well as ecclesiastical matters according to the unerring fundamentals of the socalled "law of reason." In the domain of religion, Protestant Rationalism was extending the hand to the enlightened Catholicism of Joseph II. of Austria. In the Protestant territory religious indifference was so great that an apostle of vulgar Rationalism like H. E. G. Paulus could lecture on New Testament Exegesis, for forty years (till 1851), at the University of Heidelberg. It was this indifference, cooperating with unhistorical ratio, that paved the way for the Protestant Union in Baden. Another incentive may have been the fact that lower Rhine was national German, as well as Protestant, while the more powerful Upper Rhine was devoted to France and Rome.\*

<sup>\*</sup>The people of the Upper Rhine, in whose veins not a little Celtic and Roman blood flowed, were incomparably more susceptible and impulsive—though, in ideas, less creative—than their Swabian neighbors, by whom they were called windige Franzosen. They had, at all times, evinced a boisterous enthusiasm for the new ideas that kindled the world. In the time of the crusades no part of Germany was so churchly as the Upper Rhine. In the age of the Reformation they were enthusiastic for the new doctrines, but only the minority showed endurance when the evangelical faith was tried. Again, when the alamode culture of the French made its entry into Germany, none welcomed it so enthusiastically as the sons of the Upper Rhine. See Treitschke, Deutsche Geschichte, II, 355.

The Union grants, as we shall see, "normative authority to the Augsburg Confession (as also to the Lutheran and Heidelberg Catechism)\* in so far as by it the free investigation of Scriptures, as the only source of Christian faith, is openly demanded, affirmed, and applied."† For a whole generation the Union met with no opposition worthy of mention. A few congregations dissenting from the consensus formula of the Lord's supper in the breaking of the bread, were permitted to retain the ancient rite.

It was in the fifties that Confessional consciousness awoke. Some of the rationalistic members of the High Consistory were pensioned off, rationalistic text books like Hebel's Bible History shelved, and steps taken to introduce a new Agenda and a new Catechism which should unite the Lutheran and the Heidelberg. When, in 1858, the government enjoined the use of the new Agenda, this was discovered to be too liturgical. "Being compiled from the liturgies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, its stately altar service was strange not only to the Reformed but also to the Lutherans of south-west Germany." It gave rise to opposition, an opposition that was headed by Heidelberg professors, contrasts like Daniel Schenkel and Ludwig Häusser, the historian, and resulted in a new liberal Cabinet, the liberal party getting the ascendency in 1861.

In 1867 the power of the liberals reached a climax by making, at a synodical meeting, the motion to divest the ancient Confessions of their authority. It was claimed that faithfulness to the Union pledged its members to tolerate and unconditionally admit to the same privileges those who stood by the traditional doctrines of past centuries and those who, having kept abreast of science and culture, had gained new view-points for the exhibition of Christian truth and thus changed their con-

<sup>\*</sup>This is the Union Catechism of 1882. It was only during the first years of the Union that Baden retained the old Cenfessional Catechisms. † Kurtz, Church History, II. 333.

<sup>‡</sup> In the mean time a Free Church movement had succeeded, after many trying ordeals, in getting a Lutheran Free Church legally recognized (1856). She bade fair to prosper, but dissensions among her pioneer pastors dwarfed her growth. To-day she numbers less than 4000 souls. She generally follows the Agenda of Löhe (Book of Concord).

victions. After much debating it was resolved that the rights and privileges of those who pursued independent scientific investigations should in no wise be called in question as discriminating in favor of those who fully shared the theology of the Confessions.\*

It was at the same meeting that the formula of Confessional subscription was drawn up which is in force to-day. It suffices to state the first question directed to the ordinandus: "Are you prepared to proclaim, according to best knowledge and conscience, the Word of God as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures \* \* \* in conformity with the evangelical faith and according to the Bekenntnisstand of our United Evangelical Protestant Territorial Church \* \* \* ?"†

What is this Bekenntnisstand?

The fullest, as well as the most important, answer was given in 1892 by the High Consistory.† The substance of the answer is this: (1) Section 2 of the articles of Union. (2) The interpretation of this section 2 as given by the Synod in 1855, which holds that the Word of God is the only source and norm in matters pertaining to faith, life, and doctrine, and which regards the Augsburg Confession, Luther's and the Heidelberg Catechism as normative in so far as they testify to the fundamental articles of Scripture and to the faith set forth in the œcumenical symbols of the entire Christian Church. (3) The resolution of May 18, 1867, which regards the Augsburg Confession and the two Catechisms as confessionally binding in so far as in them are contained the true foundation of evangelical Protestantism and the fundamental principles of evangelical Protestant faith. From this, continues the Consistory, follows: (4) The right and duty to subject Scripture to free and independent research. How this right and duty is to be exercised by the clergy and what limit is to be observed are ascertained from: (5) The Instructions of the Council (as far back as) 1797, which are still in force. In these it is claimed that Scripture is the supreme authority; that the Confessions

<sup>\*</sup> Hase, Neue Kirchengeschichte, (1897) II. 2nd part, p. 633.

<sup>†</sup> Mulert, Die Lehrverpflichtung \* \* \* , 49.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid 50-55.

of the Reformation are indeed more Scriptural than the doctrines in vogue prior to the Reformation, but have, on account of their philosophic dress, which changes with the times, lost some of their simplicity and Scripturalness. "The Reformers," the Instructions continue, "never intended that the Confessions should be infallible models of evangelical faith; some of the forms and expressions contained in them may be erroneous or lack clearness. Therefore, Scriptural truth should be ever sought, more and more deeply, and every member of the Church who possesses the requisite ability ought to be encouraged to independent research in Scripture. teacher [minister] is required to use the forms and expressions employed by the authors of the Confessions, if his own convictions do not impel him to this. But he is, on the other hand, not permitted to make his sermons vehicles for his own doctrines in order to suppress old ones. He must be aware of his fallibility and know that he has no right to place difficulties in the way of his hearers. As the minister wishes to enjoy security against the dominance of the Consistory, so the Consistory wishes to be secure against a dominance which is the more dangerous-that of the ministers when they press upon their congregations their own, often very narrow, views as models of belief, instead of proclaiming the doctrines of the Church which she, after long and mature examinations, conducted by devout and experienced men, has accepted." The clergyman "that violates these instructions of 1797 is to be reprimanded. If the reprimand is in vain, it must be decided if the offender ought to be treated with forbearance or requested to resign. The decisive factor to be taken into account in treating such a case is, whether the offender holds the doctrine of Christ's dominion in the Church of the New Covenant, that He redeemed with His life and death, and took possession of through the resurrection and the ascension to the Father."

The clergy of Protestant Baden have, in their capacity as official servants of the Church, no right to depart from the Agenda or to proclaim their own doctrines in the pulpit. They

have, however, a right to put their theological opinions in print, even if these should not be orthodox.

Baden's legislation on Confessional subscription thus appears somewhat complicated, anomalous, lax. Yet this State has had few heresy trials, its clergy have not been more prone to abuse the Confessions than the clergy of other states with stricter codes. Liberty is not license. No state has yet succeeded in discovering the formula that rendereth to Theology the things that are Theology's and to the Church the things that are the Church's. Nor have the universities had better success, least of all, perhaps, Germany's oldest university-ancient Heidelberg. Its spirit of compromise, manifested in the Heidelberg Catechism in the sixteenth century, is not on the decline in the nineteenth and the twentieth. Names like Paulus, Schenkel, Tröltsch confirm this. The compromise has broadened. But, as George Eliot makes one of her characters say, " where compromise broadens, intellect and conscience are thrust into narrower room." Wissen and Gewissen must receive due emphasis. They do so, as we have learned, in the formula of the Church of Saxony, which therefore is a more stable guaranty to Confessional liberty and theological progress than the verbiage officially employed to define the Bekenntnisstand of the Union Church of Baden. \*

VI. HESSE (Grand-Duchy).

Hesse has an area of 2,965 sq. miles, a population of 1,119-893. 746,201 are Protestants. The "Evangelical Church" is the established Protestant Church. Actually, though not nominally, the Church of Hesse is a Union Church. In 1822 the Union was accepted by entire Rhenish Hesse (present area 530 sq. miles: in 1900 the Protestant population was 251,873; in 1822, 80,756). The Articles of Union were drawn up by a joint committee of Lutherans and Reformed, and approved by all the congregations, the government having declared that the

\*To claim that the Union Church of Baden is Reformed, because she is not confessionally Lutheran, would be erroneous. It is also erroneous to hold with Good (Hist. of the Ref. Church in Germany, 567), that "the Reformed were entirely absorbed in the Union," and that "it is a sad fact that Heidelberg, the birthplace of the Reformed in Germany, no longer knows the Heidelberg Catechism."

Church, 564.

Union should be established only with the express approval of the congregations. In Upper Hesse and in Starkenburg, provinces on the right of the Rhine, \* the formal Union was established only where the adherents of the two Confessions lived together in the same place. Almost everywhere in Upper Hesse the congregations united by open communion, no documents being drawn up, a procedure that was encouraged by the State. Many congregations provided for common religious instruction and called their ministers without stopping to consider the Creed, thus a Union of the fusion type was encouraged. †

By an edict of 1832 a General High Consistory was entrusted with the superintendency of the Evangelical Church of Hesse, which, in the words of this edict, embraces "the Lutheran, the Retormed, and the United Confessions." The Consistory, as well as the Churches, showed that in ordinances pertaining to confirmation, to altar service, to establishing a seminary, to calling ministers, they did not consider the confessional factor where they could have done so. The Catechism used in Baden was officially recommended and generally accepted. In 1860, however, the Lutheran Catechism was pre-

\*The area of Upper Hesse is 1,269 sq. miles: its Protestant pop. in 1822 was 238,395; in 1900, 251,873. Starkenburg, with an area of 1,166 sq. miles, had, in 1822, 162,626 Protestants; in 1900, 329,800. (H. A. Krose, Konfessionsstatistik Deutschlands, (1904), p. 94. P. RE. 2 ed. VI. 73. †We have mentioned three kinds of Union: absorption, fusion, federation. "The different phases of Union have also been given another way according to Church government. Thus (1) The closest Union was in the congregation, when two congregations agreed to unite into one. (2) There was Union in a Synod, by which each congregation remained Lutheran or Reformed, but both denominations were united in a higher court, the Synod. (3) A Union still less close was in the secular court above the Synod, the Consistory; that is, the Synods remained Reformed or Lutheran, but they were united under one Consistory. Even here there was a difference, for some consistories were not divided on the

score of denomination, others were. The last was really no Union, and simply meant that each denomination remained distinct, but was under the secular control of the Consistory." Good, *History of the Reformed*  scribed for Lutheran congregations. \* The same year furnished the present ordination form. It calls for "preaching \* \* \* the whole doctrine of the Christian religion as it is contained in the books of the Old and New Testament \* \* \* and testified to in the \* \* \* Reformation Confessions of our Church, especially in the Augsburg Confession" (Köhler, Kirchenrecht, 186).

The present organization of the Church of Hesse rests upon the edict of 1874, which in polity resembles the Protestant Church of Baden. Among other things, the edict specifies that (a) as a protection to Confessional peculiarities the congregations have through their Church council, the right to decline acceptance of ecclesiastical ordinances concerning doctrine and cultus; (b) a member of the established Church cannot be refused the sacraments because of his not professing the particular creed of the congregation to which he applies for them. Hesse has no national liturgy or Agenda. In 1898 there were 466 Protestant Churches in Hesse, twenty-eight of which belonged to the Reformed, 135 to the United. (P. RE. 3rd. ed. VIII. 3f.)

Hesse has two other Protestant Churches: (a) "The Independent Ev. Luth. Church" which, protesting against the polity introduced in the seventies, claiming that this violated the rights of the Lutheran Church of Hesse, was, on the plea of the Evangelical Alliance, legally recognized, 1878. Of the fifteen pastors who threw their lot with this Church, seven were mulcted or deposed. To-day she numbers 1800 souls (P. RE. XII. 13). She accepts the Book of Concord (L 27). (b) The "Renitent Church of Lower Hesse" with 2,400 souls, follows the Hessian Church Order of 1537, thus accepting (in addition to the œcumenical symbols), Ephesinum and Chalcedonense, the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology (L 27). This Church has her beginnings in 1868–69. Some ministers of both Confessions protested against the establishing of a common consistory for the Reformed, the Lutheran, and the United-

<sup>\*</sup>The Reformed congregations use the Heidelberg Catechism. The Catechism of the United Churches in its present form was introduced in 1894. In the ten commandments and in the creed it follows Luther's Small Catechism, otherwise it also uses the Heidelberg.

In 1873 forty-two Reformed pastors of Lower Hesse, under the Metropolitan Vilmar and the Lutheran pastor Schedler declared they would not recognize the consistory but would adhere to the ancient Hessian Church order. These, too, were mulcted, punished or deposed. But they did not recognize even the deposition. Only a few had the support of their congregations. Impelled by their conscience to continue discharging the clerical functions, they sacrificed their property and suffered persecution until the year 1876 when they were declared to be laymen, thus exempted from the penalty that the law otherwise prescribed for their acts.

The national university of Hesse is Giessen. It specifies nothing whatever to its professors or licentiates of theology regarding what doctrines they are to hold and teach (M. 85).

VII. MECKLENBURG SCHWERIN (Grand-Duchy).

The area of this state is 5,135 sq. miles, its population 607,770 of which 596,671 are Lutheran, served by 360 Lutheran ministers. The Grand-ducal house of Mecklenburg is the only reigning family in Western Europe of Slavonic origin and claims to be the oldest sovereign house in the Western world. In their full title the grand-dukes style themselves Princes of the Wends. The political institutions of the Grand-Duchy are of an entirely feudal character. The religious institutions also have not manifested a very progressive spirit. One need only think of the University of Rostock, which has, as no other German university, stood for the relentless orthodoxy of the seventeenth century. It has indeed not lacked in able teachers of theology, but they have been most unsparing in their polemics, ever ready to lay the axe on arbors of irenic growth.

We might mention Kliefoth † 1895, one of the leading authorities on Liturgics in the nineteenth century, who denied a Prussian candidate the pulpit, because he feared that the young man was infected with Unionism; and who called Spener an "exotic plant" in the Lutheran Church. "With Spener," he says, "the Reformed Church began her war of conquest against the Lutheran, a war which has since inscribed on its pannier various names—first Piety, then Tolerance, then Union, then

Federation."\* Another Mecklenb'g theologian was F. A. Philippi † 1882, a Christian Jew, who wrote the first Dogmatics of renewed Lutheranism, and several works on Exegesis, "onesidedly dogmatical," as Luthardt said, and "pharisaically Judaistic," as von Hofmann claimed. It is remarkable how Kliefoth (1810-95) and Philippi (1809-1882) played the polemic against the Erlangen theologians Harless (1806-1879) and von Holmann (1810-77). Kliefoth, who held that the Lutheran pastorate was directly instituted by God, made bitter attacks on Harless and the theological faculty of Erlangen for holding the sane and ancient Protestant view, that the individual minister is recruited from the common priesthood of the congregation and empowered with its authority. In like manner Philippi waged harsh polemics against von Hofmann's Schriftbeweis, which was a golden mean between Biblical Theology and Dogmatics, claiming that his "system of theology was suffering from mortal heart failure, and destined to fall like Ananias at the feet of St. Peter." Von Hofmann, on the other hand—that prince among Lutheran theologians of last century -regarded the Lutheranism of Philippi as a yoke of legalism. Von Hofmann's program was to teach old truth in neuer Weise, which, of course, could not appeal to the unhistorical mind of Philippi, nor can appeal to anyone who confounds substance with form, truth with method.†

The attitude of Kliefoth to pietism, tolerance, union, federation, and of Philippi to new methods, was, until quite recently, characteristic of entire Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The case of Prof. Baumgarten † 1889 is well known. He was forced in 1858 to withdraw from his professorship at Rostock for emphasizing the liberty of the Church against the State, for opposing Kliefoth's idea of the ministerial office, for showing zeal against religious legalism. Philippi was behind the agitation against the outspoken professor, whose casual words were weighed on jeweler's scales by his rechtgläubigen enemies and subjected to the most squeezing Konsequenzmacherei. The

<sup>\*</sup> Hase, Neue Kirchengeschichte, II. 2, p. 623.

<sup>†</sup> In some parts of Lutheran America Philippi's Glaubenslehre possesses an almost canonical authority, where Lutheran dogmaticians like Thomasius, Kahnis, Luthardt, and Frank are feared and despised.

Catholics fared no better than the Protestant. A Roman priest engaged as private chaplain in the family of a Catholic nobleman was exiled, because the Roman cultus was tolerated only in certain localities specified by the government, to which the nobleman could lay no claim.\* The same iron hand was lifted up against the sects. They had no recognition whatever. The program of the government was: Lutheranism.

But no German state has ever been so incapable of distinguishing between historic and historical Lutheranism as the

Grand-duchy on the Baltic: hence the intolerance.

"Pure" doctrine and high liturgy did not improve the morals of the people. Mecklenburg's population was coarse and immoral. Kliefoth himself states that often a church † could not hold its Sunday services on account of the empty pews! Let us listen to the Church Historian Nippold: "The true ideal of pseudo-Lutheranism is Mecklenburg. Here the results of the seventeenth century orthodoxy were actually outbidden as far as morality is concerned \* \* \*. The frightful neglect of all national-economic factors; the ever increasing number of illegitimate births; the poor Church attendance and low condition of schools, both without a parallel, are sufficient indications of the state of affairs in this orthodox paradise. Here the intellectual and religious life has been buried by Junkerthum and Pfaffenthum. The German language really has no word which expresses these conditions so well as the proverbial "mecklenburgisch," no less mocking in German than "Jesuit" in French.1

The fact that the University of Rostock was the last of the German universities to drop the discussion of Predestination with the American Missourians was the indication of a favorable issue. No school could enhance its scholarship or gain any positive results by discussing with the followers of F. Walther, whose archaic mode of carrying on controversy and attendant in-

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid 853.

<sup>†</sup> Ibid 623.

<sup>†</sup> Nippold, Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte (1906), V. p. 321. In my correspondence to a Chicago weekly, Skandinaven, (Dec. 12, 1900) are recorded some impressions from Mecklenburg given to me by one of its gymnasium professors. They are no more favorable than Nippold's.

ability to give receipts for any new contribution to theological science, coming from an opponent, were the same then as now. Nippold is right, it seems, in claiming that the University of Rostock has of late been subjected to a "scientific rehabilitation."\*

It has, however, not forgotten the days of fighting. A theologian like W. Walther, who certainly possesses ability and is no slave of the letter, is fond of getting behind the polemic battery when it comes to deal with Catholics like Janssen and Denisle or Protestants like Hausrath, Harnack, and Loofs. A similar combativeness, but exceedingly intense and excited, was manifested at the Allgemeine Konferenz at Lund, where the Mecklenburg clergy in vain did all they could to attach the tag of heresy to Norwegian pastor Klaveness because of his plea for a reform in the method of preaching.† He was exonerated by the Konferenz. The most recent attempt of Mecklenburg to diagnose heresy is connected with the case of Schmaltz, pastor in Ludwigslust, whom the consistory deposed in 1904 for doubting the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of Christ. The next year saw the case appealed to the High Ecclesiastical Court of Rostock. It reversed the decision of the consistory on the ground that the accused had not proclaimed his doubts publicly, and ruled that since he was not guilty of ne-

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid. 323.

<sup>†</sup> Klaveness delivered his lecture in Norwegian, which the Mecklenburgers (and their supporters, the Hanoverans) most clamorous for his condemnation, least of all understood. That Klaveness is a man of decided ability and originality, is attested by his sermons which have been translated into six or seven languages. The Konferenz appreciated him better than some of the Lutheran Church papers of America that have been busy in belittling his person, aim, and method. Limiting ourselves to the man as a preacher a quotation from M. Schian's article on "Predigt" in Herzog-Hauck's P. RE. XV. 73of. will characterize him. In speaking of the different schools of preaching in Norway, Schian says: "Daneben ist in jüngster Zeit eine mehr 'moderne' Predigt getreten, die mit ähnlichen Bestrebungen in Deutschland etwa parallel geht, während sie doch theologisch der lutherischen Kirchenlehre erheblich näher bleibt, als das in Deutschland geschieht. Man hat hier die Aufgabe erkannt, auch durch die Predigt dem modernen Kulturmenschen mit warmherzigem Verständnis zu begegnen und ihn, indem man sowohl von dem orthodoxen Lehrstuhl wie von dem Piedestal pietistischer Frömmigkeit herabsteigt, für Kirche und Christentum zu gewinnen. Bedeutendster Verfechter und praktischer Vertreter dieser Richtung ist Th. Klaveness."

glect to recite the Apostles' Creed at the Church services, at baptism, and confirmation, he confessed the truths of the creed and thus could not be subjected to judicial arraignment.\* This ruling of the highest ecclesiastical instance in Germany's most "conservatively Lutheran" State thus countenances the theory of Th. Kaftan (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1907, 83-86), as much as do the more "liberal" States.

Mecklenburg-Schwerin accepts the Book of Concord. The graduate of theology is asked if he, in case of entering the ministry, "is willing to abide by the Confessions and ordinances

of our [viz. Mecklenburg-Schwerin] Church."

At the three hundredth anniversary of the Book of Concord, Ferdinand Philippi (not to be confused with Fr. A, mentioned above) published a booklet of 110 pages, pleading for the B. C. as a symbol. He stands for quia, objecting to quaterus. The subscription, he claims, obligates to the entire system of doctrines given by the B. C. with all the necessary consequences and results, † not, however, to the letter: The method of proving a statement, the interpretation of a Biblical passage, the historical statements, the exegesis employed are not binding in every instance, I Luthardt's position (at the Saxon synod in 1876) is too unorthodox for Philippi. Bekenntnisabweichung, Bekenntnisverdunkelung is what he charges Luthardt with, who claims that theology as a science should not be tied down to the symbols. He asks if 2 Tim. 2:16 might not apply to Luthardt and likeminded, who are guilty of "Krausmachen! " §

<sup>\*</sup> M. 104.

<sup>†</sup> Philippi, Diè Notwendigkeit und Verbindlichkeit des kirchlichen Bekenntnisses, p. 78. Philippi's posițion, on the the whole, is that of General Council and Iowa.

<sup>†</sup> Ibid 98.

<sup>&</sup>amp; Ibid. 99, Cfr. page 2: "Selbstim Königreich Sachsen hat man vor nicht langer Zeit die Verpflichtungsformel formell und materiell auf den vermittelnden Vorschlag Dr. Luthardts abgeschwächt und ihr eine solche Fassung gegeben, dass auch Männer von freierer Richtung und weiterem Gewissen sich wohl dabei beruhigen können."

Perhaps no one in modern Germany has fought so bravely for the Lutheran Confession as Luthardt in the paper which he edited since 1868: Allgemeine Luth. Kirchenzeitung. In a pamphlet "Die Synoden und die Kirchenlehre," (1871). p. 38, he says: "It makes no difference

The plea for the Book of Concord, coming from Mecklenburg was, as far as Germany is concerned—though not America—a vain piece of work. For if the worth of the B. C. should be determined by the religious and theological conditions prevailing in a State, the work of 1580 could find no worse advocate than Mecklenburg-Schwerin, twenty-five years ago.\* The present condition of M-S. has its bright sides

\*Judging from the following startling statements of Prof. Schodde, the Ohio Synod is not far from following Missouri. He says: "It has repeatedly been claimed, and seemingly with justice, that there is only one man in connection with a Protestant theological faculty in a German university who still holds to the verbal inspiration theory of the heroic age of Lutheran theology, and this man is Professor Nösgen, of Rostock. It is accordingly not too much to say that the Lutheran Church, too, as represented by the official theological teachers in the land of Luther, has broken away in principle from the great truth for which the Reformer would have been willing to give up his life," (Columbus Theological Magazine, Dec. 1906, p. 328.)

What a charge! That out of Germany's 191 Protestant theological teachers (157 professors, 34 docents), in her 17 Protestant universities with 2,287 students of Protestant theology, only one (and he in Germany's smallest university, with 57 theological students) is true to the principle which Luther valued higher than his own life! No wonder that such charges foster the kind of fanaticism which a graduate student of Ohio Synod, so-journing a few fortnights in Germany, gave classic expression to by his raid on the teaching of theology in German universities, printed in the Lutheran Church Review, Oct. 1906, p. 699ff.

if a Lutheran Church does not subscribe to this or that particular symbol, for it is not the symbols as such that make her a Lutheran Church, but it is the doctrine which is contained in these symbols. And though a part of the Luth. Church, through some historical circumstances, acknowledges only the Augsburg Confession as legally binding, this fact does not involve a difference in the doctrine itself." Cfr. p. 49f.: "In welchem Umfang aber die Bekenntnisse bindend sind, das entscheidet sich geschichtlich. Je nachdem eine einzelne Provinz in die Bewegung und Entwicklungen der folgenden Zeit mehr oder minder mit hineingezogen worden war und sich für sie dadurch die Notwendigkeit genauerer Feststellung der evangelischen Grundlehren nöthig gemacht hat, in dem Masse hat sich auch der Umfang der Bekenntnisschriften für die betreffende Kirche festgestellt. Die Abweichung in der Zahl der einzelnen Schriften ist demnach geschichtlich veranlasst, ohne, wie ich schon früher ausführte, damit eine Verschiedenheit der Lehre zu involvieren."

"Where the Lutheran Confession holds sway, there is the Lutheran Church, whether she is in Russia or in Scandinavia or in America or in and is very encouraging compared with the condition that prevailed in the past. As Rostock has rehabilitated itself scientifically, so Christian Charity has become a powerful factor in Mecklenburg: The Deaconesses' Home in Ludwigslust numbered in 1901 no less than 280 sisters. Nevertheless, much remains to be done to warrant Lutheran America to hold up Mecklenburg, especially Rostock, as the model of sound orthodoxy in Germany. Rostock has for a long time been the Shilo for that portion of American Lutherans which reserves the B. C. as the symbol of Lutheranism uncorrupt. Theological faculties would approve of a theological student's studying at no other German university than Rostock, whose adherence to the symbols was so faithful that the Missourians, when they put a premium on orthodoxy, only with regrets bade the University on the Warnow their go and begone, the other universities being already anathematized.

Will those who have hitherto admired the spirit of Rostock, now, when it has rehabilitated itself, likewise bid it adieu and like the Missourians, put up a new noli me tangere?

Australia or in India, and whether she has the consistorial form of government, as [in Germany], or the synodical, as in America, or the episcopal, as in Scandinavia. For the character of the Church is not determined by polity or by external ordinances and usages; it is determined by her doctrine and Confession \* \* \* ; a member of the Lutheran Church of any country, on moving into another country, is forthwith regarded as a member of the Lutheran Church of this country as well" (p. 46).

It is clear from the above, that Luthardt, were he living, would not endorse General Council and Iowa representatives in making the Lutheran Confession identical with the Book of Concord. It is also clear, that he would not join them in questioning the title of the General Synod as a Lutheran body and in objecting, as especially Iowa did, to its participating in the Allgemeine Konferenz that had been planned for Philadelphia.

(TO BE CONCLUDED).

## ARTICLE IV.

# THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL: A SUPPLEMENT.

By Professor J. W. Richard, D.D., LL.D.

The Theological Quarterly for October, 1906, and for January, 1907, contains an article entitled: The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will in the Augsburg Confession. The article is signed Fr. Schwarz, Carroll, Nebr. Who Fr. Schwarz is we do not know! Happily the days of Don Quixote are passed. A knight sallying forth in quest of glory or for the vindication of some fair dulcinea is not now required to announce his pedigree, or to blazon his achievements.

"Rank is but the guinea stamp, The man's the gowd for a'that."

Fr. Schwarz has as good right on the arena theological as any other man has. We bid him welcome; albeit it is not our intention to break a lance with this, the latest, champion of Missouri's peculiar doctrine of Free-will, though, inasmuch as the Theological Quarterly is "published by the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other states," the article in question bears necessarily an official character, and is to be regarded as Missouri's answer to the articles on The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will which appeared in THE LUTHERAN QUAR-TERLY in the Year 1905-a kind of last word as Missouri is bowing herself down and out from the Intersynodical Conferences which had been held from time to time for the purpose of effecting an understanding among synods which taught differently on the subjects of Conversion and Regeneration. Further than this we do not care to speak of the article, except to say that in form, in content, and in spirit, it is out and out Missouriish-a fair sample of that kind of theological polemic which for two generations has been practiced, chiefly on the Western bank of the Missouri River, in defense of an indefensible type of Lutheranism. We simply ask our readers to procure a copy of Fr. Schwarz's article, and to acquaint themselves with its contents at first hand. But we wish to say for ourself that the present article is not to be construed as a reply to anything found in the article of Fr. Schwarz, but only as the execution of a purpose, formed more than a year ago, to supplement the articles that appeared on the same subject in The LUTHERAN QUARTERLY in the year 1905. And in the execution of our purpose we must begin again with Article XVIII. of the Augsburg Confession; for this being the fundamental and normating Lutheran Confession, it must follow that what it teaches on any subject must have fundamental and norma normata authority as a Lutheran doctrine. though of course the Confession itself must always be tested by the Holy Scriptures, which constitute the only rule of doc-Hence should any one inquire, What does the Lutheran Church, the whole Lutheran Church, teach on the subject of Free-will (liberum arbitrium), we would have to point to Article XVIII, of the Augustana, though in order to get at and to get out the meaning of the said Article we would have to study its antecedents, as would have to be done in ascertaining the meaning of all articles of faith, for they all have a history, and to know the history of an article of faith, especially its antecedent history, is, in large part, to know the meaning of the article, for an article of faith is always promulgated in view of some antecedent teaching on the same subject.

### I. THE ANTECEDENTS.

In order to get at and to get out the meaning of the fundamental teaching of the Lutheran Church on the subject of Freewill, it will not be necessary to discuss at length here the absolute Determinism of Luther as expressed in The Assertion of all the Articles (1520), and in the De Servo Arbitrio (1525); nor that of Melanchthon as expressed in the Loci Communes of 1521. Let it suffice here to give a tew characteristic specimens from the writings of each. Luther: "Free-will is a figment in things or a name without reality." "All things occur in consequence of absolute necessity." "This especially is necessary for a Christian to know: God foresees nothing contingently, but he foresees, and purposes, and does all things by an unchangeable, eternal, infallible Will; all things which oc-

cur are of pure necessity; God moves all in all, necessarily also moves and operates in Satan and in the impious." \* Melanchthon: "Since all things which occur occur necessarily according to the divine predestination, there is no freedom of our Will." "The Scriptures teach that all things occur necessarily." "The Scripture takes freedom from our Will by the necessity of predestination." "I will not use the words Freewill and Reason."

These quotations show that Free-will (liberum arbitrium) and the freedom of the Will (libertas voluntatis) were utterly repudiated by Luther and Melanchthon in their earlier treatises; though it is proper to say that Melanchthon was scarcely more at that time than the echo and interpreter of Luther.

But already in 1524 Melanchthon began to show signs of dissatisfaction with Luther's views on this subject. And late in this year or early in the next Cochlaeus published a refutation of Melanchthon's doctrine of Free-will, showing that beyond all doubt the Fathers and writers clear back to the beginning of Christianity had taught and affirmed the doctrine of Free-will. And what is remarkable, he quotes from Book 3 of the Hypognosticon, † from which Melanchthon quotes in Article XVIII. of the Confession. This shows that in five years Melanchthon has accepted an authority from his opponent and uses it for the proof of Free-will, just as his opponent did. Undoubtedly he was influenced by Cochlaeus' refutation.

In 1526, when he formally entered the theological faculty, his independence soon developed so far that he became a quiet critic of Luther's views, as is shown in his more lively correspondence with his humanistic friends, and in his determination to lecture on the Ethics of Aristotle. In 1527, while residing at Jena, he published his Scholia on Colossians, in an Excursus to which, on the Will, we find not a single trace of deterministic predestination. On the contrary we find it here asserted without qualification that the human Will has the power of choosing external things, that is, that it has a natural or essen-

<sup>\*</sup> See Loofs, Dogmengeschichte, Viert. Auf. (1906), pp. 755 et seqq. . + Lib. II. p. 11.

tial freedom. "God moves trees in one way, cattle in another way, men in another way; on man he has bestowed reason. That power of choice (electionem) he does not remove, but imparts life and motion, while we choose and act, as that is true which is written: In him we are, live and are moved." What he denies is that the human will does not have the freedom to work Christian or spiritual righteousness. "We have need of the Holy Spirit to renew and to cleanse us." So that what Plitt says in regard to the eighteenth Article is equally applicable to this its antecedent: "Here we meet with not a trace of the false philosophical argument for the doctrine which earlier had here and there appeared; much rather is there also conceded to the natural man a certain freedom, and only is it declared that with all this he cannot live acceptably to God, since he is born in original sin."\*

And still Melanchthon moved forward. March 22nd, 1528, he wrote a most cordial letter to Erasmus, Luther's bitter opponent, and said, inter alia: "I have at no time been so enamored of Luther as to approve his vehemence in controversy. Far be it from me now to assist by pouring oil on the flame. And of this my judgment Luther himself is the best witness,"+ alluding, doubtless, to Luther's silence in regard to Erasmus's Hyperaspistes, which, to say the least, is a very strong work, and which effectually disposed of Luther's allegation that Erasmus was an Epicurean. Indeed the Hyperaspistes may be regarded as in no trifling sense an antecedent of the Excursus and of the eighteenth Article of the Confession, for certain it is that Melanchthon was influenced by it, and his letter shows that now, at the beginning of 1528, he stands quite as close to Erasmus as he does to Luther on the subject of Free-will, and it is also certain that the doctrine of Free-will contained in the Excursus is fundamentally different from the doctrine of necessity and of predestination that had been so unequivocally asserted in the Loci and in the De Servo Arbitrio. And very explicit is he when now he declares that "the human will is a free power, so that it can perform the righteousness of the

<sup>\*</sup> Einleitung II. pp. 136-7.

<sup>†</sup> C. R. I. p. 946.

flesh, or civil righteousness;" and still further is the thought carried in the direction of the ethics of faith and of conversion, when he declares that by preaching "repentance and contrition" from the law the way is prepared for faith.

Hence Agricola was perfectly right when from the earlier common standpoint, he found fault with this teaching. It was not what Melanchthon and Luther had previously taught on the subject. An evident innovation had been made, and such in general is the judgment of all competent scholars.

After a most minute examination of the facts, as exhibited partly in Melanchthon's letters and partly in his more formal writings, Mix declares: "With the year 1527 Melanchthon recovered his complete independence, and now becomes clear also in regard to his future position. In the controversy with Erasmus he had become convinced that Luther's position was too harsh, and that an intermediate one is better, and this intermediate position he now took for the future, acting the part of mediator, as was wholly in accord with his character, which loved peace and praised wisdom."\*

And Seeberg: "There are two doctrines upon which Melanchthon consciously differed from Luther, viz., Free-will and the Lord's Supper. That he wavered from his original deterministic position is perhaps to be attributed to the influence of the polemical writings of Erasmus against Luther. As early as 1527 in his exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians he recognizes human freedom in the outward sphere, though no one can fear and love God, except he be impelled by the Holy Spirit." †

Galle speaks in clear terms of Melanchthon's change of view in regard to the doctrine of Free-will, and attributes the change to the Erasmus-Luther's controversy, and to the study of the Bible. ‡ And certainly, when we compare the Excursus with the Loci, we find that while in the Loci the author appeals mainly to the Old Testament, in the Excursus he appeals only to the New Testament. The basis for judgment has been

<sup>\*</sup> Studien und Kritiken (1901), p. 491.

<sup>†</sup> Dogmengeschichte, II. p, 349.

<sup>†</sup> Characteristik Melanchthons, pp. 275 et seqq.

greatly changed. In general it is from the Old Testament to the New Testament conception of God and of man. Herrlinger, a specialist on the theology of Melanchthon, declares that "the Visitation Articles and the Scholia on the Epistle to the Colossians begin the transformation of the doctrine. Visitation Articles declare expressly that it is the chief mission of the preaching of the Gospel to point out the ethical mediation of the Gospel," \* which is necessarily based on the conception that man has some power of choice. And Loofs, in discussing Luther's later relations to the doctrines of Predestination and Free-will, after again and again referring to Melanchthon's change, says that while Luther never disavowed the De Servo Arbitrio, "he never again expressly spoke in favor of Determinism. But he often spoke of a righteousness which even the heathen had, without thinking of the sole causation (Allwirksamkeit) of God. And hence, though in December, 1524, he had spoken on the pulpit of God's sovereign will, now hardening, now saving, he never again preached on the subject. Yea, Luther, knowing that a heart seeking the assurance of salvation in predestination by reflection on God's secret will, is not satisfied but exposed to danger, with growing emphasis insisted that 'we must not inquire about the predestination of the hidden God, but must rest in that which is revealed by the call, and by the ministry of the word.' The divine predestination remained for him the background of the economy of salvation, comforting for the faith of the individual, but apart from all speculation. It never occurred to him to bring out the 'perseverence of the saints,' or 'the amissibility of grace' as a consequence of the doctrine of predestination. Nevertheless Luther in a certain sense held fast to the deterministic doctrine which he had developed against Erasmus." †

Surely those of our readers who do not have access to the writings of Luther and Melanchthon, will be impressed by the judgments of the learned men whom we have just quoted. Those men did not write for the purpose of sustaining a thesis,

<sup>\*</sup> Die Theologie Melanchthons, p. 73.

<sup>†</sup> Dogmengeschichte, ut supra, II., p. 761-2.

or in the interest of a confessional position, or for the support of a favorite doctrine, but for the scientific purpose of exhibiting the facts, for it is history that they have written, and not dogma. They all (Loofs included) declare that Melanchthon had, prior to 1530, departed from his own earlier and from Luther's doctrine of Free-will. And it can be easily shown that the most orthodox Lutheran theologians generally agree with Loofs in the declaration that while Luther never disavowed his deterministic views, he did, nevertheless, allow them to drop into the background, and evermore laid stress on the revealed will of God, on the universality of the call and on the preaching of the Word,—and this means practically the abandonment of his earlier views on Predestination and Free-will.

And that Melanchthon was still persisting in his changed views and that he had come to complete independence on the subject, is proved by the fact that, October 2nd, 1527, he called Luther's attention to his treatment of the subject in his Colossians, and declared his intention of treating it more extensively in another writing at no distant day. \* That he had now abandoned the views set forth in the Loci is shown conclusively by his declaration in his Ratio Discendae Theologiae (1530), in which he commands the reading of the Scholia on Colossians, but says: "I would also order the reading of my Loci Communes, but they contain much that is yet crude, and that I have decided to change. It is easy to understand what displeases me there, from my Colossians, where I have modified some subjects." †

The facts are simply these: Melanchthon had abandoned his and Luther's doctrine of Determinism, and had reached the conclusion that Man's Will is essentially free, that he can make choices, and that he has the power to execute civil righteousness. Hence between this his present teaching de libero arbitrio, and the former, namely, that "there is no freedom in our will," that "all things occur necessarily," there is a principiant difference. The former teaching and the latter belong

<sup>\*</sup> C. R. I., p. 893. † Ibid. II., p. 457.

to different categories of thought. They cannot be expressed in the same terms. The one is *a priori*; the other is *a posteriori*. The one is metaphysical; the other is psychological.

But while on the one hand the reading of the Hyperaspistes and the further study of the Scriptures had led Melanchthon away from Determinism, they did not on the other conduct him to Pelagianism, for at this very time he enunciated a principle from which he never retreated, and which he reiterated again and again to the end of his life, viz.: "The nature of man by the natural powers is not able to work the true fear of God, and true confidence toward God, and spiritual affections, and spiritual conduct" (Excursus), and which, in words substantially identical, he subsequently introduced into the damnatory (Latin) portion of the eighteenth Article of the Confession.

Two things are now absolutely certain: By the year 1530 Melanchthon has abandoned Determinism and has affirmed "the need of the Holy Spirit to renew and cleanse us." These facts must be kept in the foreground in our inquiry into the meaning of the eighteenth Article. Also we must consider the purpose and aim of the Confession in general. The doctrinal Articles were an after-thought, an accident. At Wittenberg and at Coburg it had been decided that doctrines should not be treated in the "Apology." On the contrary it was specifically declared that no new doctrines had been introduced in the Elector's dominions, and that no doctrinal teaching was tolerated that deviated from that of the Catholic Church, meaning the Church of their opponents. And as a matter of fact the Confession in the form in which it was delivered does not disapprove nor condemn a single dogmatic tradition, nor a single doctrine, of the Roman Catholic Church; but on the contrary it declares that it contains nothing that deviates from the Catholic Church, or from the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers; German: "From the writings of the Fathers." And in the form in which the Confession was delivered we are confronted with the declaration: "The entire difference has reference to some few abuses "-as the account which the Confession gives of itself, and which dare not be ig-

nored nor slighted in our efforts to ascertain the meaning of the Confession, or of any one of its Articles of faith. over, the mental state of the author at the time of composition, the avowed purpose, the contemporaneous views, sentiments and declarations are recognized and considered by historians, diplomatists and other interpreters of venerable documents, as well as the verba ipsissima of the documents according to historical and grammatical usage. Hence in interpreting Article XVIII. of the Confession we dare not read into it the sentiments of the De Servo Arbitrio, which, we know of a certainty, had been abandoned by Melanchthon, and which Luther had allowed to drop into the background. Neither dare we read into it the sentiments contained in Article II. of the Formula of Concord, which, as we demonstrated in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1905, are Flacianistic to the core, and which are not found in any Lutheran creed or confession promulgated during the first fifty years of the existence of the Lutheran Church, and which are absolutely out of harmony with the mind of the author of the Confession in 1530, irreconcilable with the avowed purpose of the Confession and contradictory of what is affirmed in regard to agreement, etc., with the Roman Church. In other words, in trying to ascertain the meaning of the Confession, or of any of its parts, we must apply a judicious historical criticism, just such as we apply in trying to ascertain the meaning of Magna Charter, or of the Declaration of American Independence. The Augsburg Confession is a historical document, and it must be interpreted by methods adapted to its character. Hence in our interpretation of the Confession we must take into the account its antecedent history, the history of its genesis, the affirmations which it makes about itself, its verba ipsissima, the interpretations of those who first used it, and of those who first examined it with hostile intent. In a word, the entire psychology of the situation must be ascertained and estimated.

## II. ARTICLE XVIII.

"Of Free-will it is taught that man to some extent has Freewill, to live externally honorably and to choose among things that reason comprehends. But without grace, assistance and the operation of the Holy Spirit, man is not able to become pleasing to God, to fear God from the heart, or to believe, or to cast inborn evil lust out of the heart, but such is effected by the agency of the Holy Spirit, who is given by means of the Word of God. For Paul says in the First to the Corinthians 2: The natural man understandeth nothing of the Spirit of God.

"And in order that we may understand that herewith nothing new is taught, the clear words of Augustine concerning Free-will are here quoted from the third book Hypognosticon: We confess that in all men there is a Free-will," \* etc.

Or as it is taught in the corresponding Latin: De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem iustitiam et deligendas res racioni subiectas. Sed non habet vim sine spiritu sancto efficiendae iustitiae dei seu iustitiae spiritualis; quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quae sunt spiritus dei. Sed haec fit in cordibus, cum per verbum spiritus sanctus concipitur. Haec totidem verbis dicit Augustinus lib. III. Hypognosticon: Esse fatemur liberum arbitrium omnibus hominibus," etc.

If now we analyze our Article we find: 1. There is Freewill (liberum arbitrium) in all men. This is expressly denied by Luther, who says that Free-will is a name without a reality.

2. A clear and unequivocal recognition of the essential freedom of the Will. Man has the power to choose. In this power lies the very essence of freedom, for the Will is the soul's power for choosing, and is the most exalted faculty of the soul. Also according to our Article, the Will can do things that are right in external relations. Man can live an externally upright life.

This concession absolutely excludes the doctrine of Determinism, and stands in marked contrast with the declaration in the *Loci* that "neither in external nor in internal works is there any freedom, but all things turn out according to the divine determination," as elsewhere Melanchthon has declared that David's adultery and Judas's betrayal of Christ no less than

<sup>\*</sup>Our translation is made from Tschackert's Critical Text, which, rather than the Editio Princeps, represents the Confession as it was read.

Paul's call, were wrought by God non permissive, sed potenter.

3. Man has no power in himself to do that which is well-pleasing to God, such as to fear God from the heart, or to exercise faith, or to expel innate evil from the heart. There is in man, left to himself, a lack of ability to do these things. And the reason given for this natural inability is lodged in the understanding: He cannot understand spiritual things. Consequently the Will acts perversely every time. The data furnished by the understanding are both inadequate and false.

The Will chooses, indeed it must choose, for the mind acts as a unit, and every act of knowing is followed (logical sequence) by an act of choosing, but the Will chooses the wrong alternative, the external thing, because this is understood by the natural man, whereas spiritual things are not understood. They are presented to the Will in the light of foolishness. Thus man per se or by "the powers of nature alone" cannot work spiritual righteousness. "When God does not assist," man or "the Will of man [for the act is the act of the man] turns itself from God." Article XIX.

4. In order to work spiritual righteousness man needs "grace, assistance and the operation of the Holy Spirit," who is God's Agent for the application of redemption, who takes the things of Christ and shows them to men and assists their infirmities. Without "grace" etc., man is not able. With "grace" etc., he is able-he is enabled to do what formerly he could not do, for the doing is his. The Will, as the old theologians said, is not annulled, removed, destroyed, by the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit. It is placed in a condition in which it can make spiritual choices. Or as Augustine has said: "Grace precedes him who is unwilling that he may will. It follows him who is willing, so that he may not will in vain." But the thing to be especially emphasized is that the Will acts. Absolute passivity is out of the question when we use the words grace, assistance, with reference to a moral agent. We never associate with these words the thought of necessitas, or of coactio. Hence when it is said in the Latin, "Without the Holy Spirit the human will does not have the power to perform

the righteousness of God or spiritual Righteousness," the clear implication is that with the Holy Spirit it has the power, that is, man can do this thing by assistance which he could not do without assistance. He is not merely passive, like a "block," like a "stone," under the grace and assistance of the Holy Spirit. He chooses, he consents, he conforms, he obeys. As Augustine says: "He consents to the call of God."

And very pertinently was this conception of the Verhalten, of the activity of the Will in conjunction with the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit, illustrated by Dr. Schmidt in the late Intersynodical Conference at Ft. Wayne, Indiana, October 24th, 1906: "By means of a train I can reach my home in fifteen hours, but only when I take the train." \* Thus by the assistance and operation of the train Dr. Schmidt was enabled to do what without the train it was naturally and absolutely impossible for him to do. must choose and consent to that mode of transportation; he must conform to the regulations of the railroad; he must obey those who have the train in charge. Dr. Schmidt acts, he cooperates. Or to generalize in the words of Augustine: Praecedente gratia, comitante voluntate, that is, "when grace pre. cedes, the Will follows." The Holy Spirit by means of the divine word illumines the mind, so that it can understand, and know and judge spiritual things. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." In the light of spiritual knowledge the Will adjuvante Deo can work spiritual righteousness. But this working of the Will under the Spirit's grace and assistance is neither causa efficiens nor causa meritoria as related to justification. It has created nothing; it has merited nothing. Salvation is by grace; Faith is the gift of God. But grace and gift presuppose use and activity on the part of the subject, and their end is the removal of limitations and the induement of the accipient with "power."

Now the Article declares that there is "nothing new" in this teaching, and to prove the declaration, it quotes, as it supposes, from the most authoritative teacher of the Catholic

<sup>\*</sup> Theologische Quartelschrift, January, 1907, p. 55.

Church, \* who, that is, Augustine, never taught such a doctrine of Free will as is found in the *De Servo Arbitrio* and in the *Loci* of 1521; and well did the author of the Confession and his learned theological counsellors at Augsburg know that neither Augustine nor any other standard doctor of the Church, nor any synod nor any council of the Church, had ever taught such a doctrine of Free-will as is taught in the treatises just named above; and they knew that when such teaching had appeared among the Manichaeans and in Marcion, it had been promptly condemned by the Church. †

But in addition to this specific declaration—"nothing new" -in the eighteenth Article, we have the declaration in regard to the entire Confession that it contains "nothing that differs from the Scriptures, or from the Catholic Church, or from the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers." if the doctrine of the entire Confession is in harmony with the teaching of the Catholic Church and with that of the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers, it must follow, since the eighteenth Article has its own specific declaration to the same effect, that said Article must, a fortiori, be placed in the same category: It teaches the doctrine of Free-will that is taught in the Catholic and in the Roman Church, and every time we subscribe the Confession as a whole or any one of its doctrinal articles we do so with such an understanding, unless we express a reservation. It is a plain case—a case of truth or of talsehood on the part of the Confession itself or rather on the part of the Confessors themselves. Either they affirmed a truth and a conviction, or they told a falsehood for the purpose of deceiving their opponents. The supposition of ignorance is out of the question.

Does, then, Article XVIII. of the Augsburg Confession teach a doctrine of Free-will that does not differ from that taught in and by the Catholic and Roman Church? We say, Yes, in so far as that doctrine is known from writers and from

<sup>\*</sup> The Hypognosticon is not Augustine's work.

<sup>†</sup> Very properly does Loofs say: "Augustine was not a Determinist." Dogmengeschichte, p. 411.

the decrees of the Church. But in saying Yes to this question we do not mean to say that every writer who has written on the subject under the ægis of the Catholic or of the Roman Church has so taught, anymore than we should wish to say that every person who has written on the same subject under the ægis of the Lutheran Church, has so taught, for it is a pretty plain case that some Catholic and Roman Catholic writers have taught a doctrine of Free will that is Pelagianizing, just as it is evident that some Lutheran writers have taught a doctrine of Free-will that is decidedly deterministic. But there is such a thing as a consensus doctrinae, which, though it be not absolute, is nevertheless sufficiently explicit, and is distinct enough to be seen and to be known. It is found in the socalled standard writers, and in the decrees, of a Church. It is identity in kind and in species and in intent of teaching, though the form and the expression may not be identical. It is to this consensus that we now appeal for assistance in interpreting our Article.

#### III. THE CATHOLIC CONFUTATORS.

Very shortly after the Confession had been publicly read, the Emperor Charles V. appointed a committee of theologians, twenty or more in number, and charged them to examine and to retute the Lutheran document. Among those theologians were Eck, Fabri, Cochlaeus, Wimpina, who (and others) had for years been in violent controversy with Luther and Melanchthon, and had paraded against them scores and scores of charges of heresy. Also they were as decidedly prejudiced against the Protestant cause as it was possible for men to be. In scholarship, in dialectic skill, and in acquaintance with the theology of the Roman Church, they had no superiors, perhaps no equals. They were zealous adherents of the Roman Church, and were willing to spend and to be spent in her service. They were in a frame of mind to discover and to magnify even the minutest deviation from the Catholic and from the Roman teaching, that, if for on other reason, they might justify their own former contentions, and might have grounds for insisting

still more strenuously on the suppression of the Lutheran heresy.

It was with such qualifications and in such frame of mind that the Confutators began their work of examining the Augsburg Confession with special reference to its Confutation; and so determined were they to admit nothing that looked toward the restoration of harmony that they even excluded from their counsels those who favored mildness and peace.\*

July 8th the Committee submitted what is known as The Confutation of the Augsburg Confession in its First Form. †

"Of Free will they teach that the human will has some liberty for performing civil righteousness and for choosing those things that are subject to reason; but it does not have the power without the Holy Spirit to perform the righteousness of God or spiritual righteousness."

# " RESPONSE."

"Sound and Catholic is the declaration of the princes; for all Catholics have held, as against the Pelagians, namely, that man without grace is not competent for good meritorious works. For the beginning of our salvation we have in the compassion of God. Nevertheless he is competent for opera similia; likewise is he competent for good works, if he be assisted by grace, as we have shown in Article sixth. But the princes must be reminded that their preachers have revived the heresy of the Manichaeans, and have denied Free-will abso. lutely. For Luther has somewhere said: Free-will is a thing in name only, and while it does what is in se, it sins mortally. Luther in the Assertions has said: All things occur by an absolute necessity. This impious error of Wiklit was condemned by a council at Rome and at Constance. Melanchthon has said: All things that occur, occur by the divine predestination. Therefore there is no freedom of our will. For according to his predestination all things occur necessarily in all creatures. Melanchthon has also written: Experience teaches that in dispositions there is no freedom. Luther has taught: When

<sup>\*</sup> C. R. 27: p. 5.

<sup>†</sup> Published by Johannes Ficker in 1891.

Satan is master the word *liberum arbitrium* comes to seduce men from God, for it is a figment, because the Will does nothing towards its own willing, and it is not true that it has activity in a good work. Melanchthon says: The phrase *liberum arbitrium*, though most alien to the Scriptures, to the mind and purpose of the Spirit, has been used.

"The preachers have rejected Free-will, contrary to what has been here done by the princes, who hold correctly and commendably in regard to Free-will. Therefore they must be admonished to have the preachers recant this erroneous doctrine of the Manichaeans, and deliver the people from this heresy, since we have the power of our wills, as St. Paul says, I Cor. 7. And in one word Christ refuted the Manichaeans, when he said: The poor ye have always with you, and when ye will ye can do them good. Mark 14."

If we examine this Response analytically we find that it approves the Article without qualification as sound and Catholic. It affirms the need of grace. It condemns the Determinism of Luther and Melanchthon.\* It praises the princes for their correct teaching on Free-will.

August 3rd the Confutators presented a final report, which was accepted by the Emperor, and which, at least in a secondary sense, is regarded as a symbolical writing of the Roman Church, "for it undoubtedly exhibits the then current faith of the Church, though wanting in ecclesiastical authorization."† Of Article XVIII. the Confutators say: "The Confession is

<sup>\*</sup>It may seem harsh that the Confutators should catalogue Luther with the Manichaeans. But so late as 1595 David Chytraeus, one of the authors of the Form of Concord, characterized Luther's earlier teaching as "stoic and Manichaean necessity." Epistolae, pp. 1267 et seqq. In the De Servo Arbitrio Luther quotes with approbation and for the confirmation of his own assertions some of the most fatalistic passages of the heathen poets, as from Virgil in regard to the destruction of Troy and on the rise of the Roman Empire. De Servo Arbitrio, Erl. Latin, 7. p. 136. Pharaoh was hardened, not permissively, but by direct action of omnipotence. Ut Supra, p. 261 et seqq.. In Luther's own words: "Free-will is a downright lie." P. 119. And Melanchthon called Luther's doctrine of Free-will "Stoic and Manichaean deliria."

<sup>†</sup> Winer, Confessions, p. 11.

1907]

accepted and approved. For thus the Catholics take the via media, so as not to concede too much to Free-will with the Pelagians, nor with the Manichaeans to take from it all freedom, for both are not without fault. Thus says Augustine: 'That there is Free-will in man we assuredly believe and preach without doubt."'

That the Lutherans assembled at Augsburg found no fault with the judgment expressed by the Confutators is shown by the fact (a) that, in the Apology as at first offered to the Emperor, September 22d, the eighteenth Article is passed over in silence; and by the fact (b) that in the Apology as published the next year not one word is said in refutation of the Catholic interpretation of the Article. Very justly has Plitt said: "The amplification in the Apology presents nothing new in connection with the Article in the Confession, and as little does it take back or correct anything. Melanchthon limits himself in the matter to guarding against the misunderstanding of what had been said there."\*

The discussion of the subject in the Apology concedes, and affirms over and over, the essential freedom of the Will, and as positively does it affirm the need of the Holy Spirit in order that man may perform spiritual righteousness. In a word, the Apology simply amplifies the sentiment of the Article, though it classes "our adversaries" with the Pelagians, because of the identity of their teaching with that of the Pelagians, which may indeed be true, to some extent, of some teachers of the Roman Catholic Church of that day; but it is not true of the Catholic and of the Roman Church as a whole, just as it may be said that some Lutheran theologians have taught Determinism and particularistic predestination, but the Lutheran Church does not profess to teach either. And it is very certain that the Roman Catholic Church, as such, and her great standard writers have repudiated Pelagianism, and have insisted that there is need of divine grace, of divine assistance, of the Holy Spirit, to excite the Will and to enable it to work the righteousness of God. In other words, the Roman Church and her great

<sup>\*</sup> Die Apologie der Augustana, p. 206.

writers have treated the subject of Free-will essentially as it is treated in the Confession and in the Apology; and the pivotal words and technical forms of expression that characterize the teaching of the Confession and of the Apology on the subject, and especially those of the Excursus, from which the Article is so largely drawn, are found abundantly in the standard writers of the Roman Catholic Church, showing thus the sources from which Melanchthon drew, which fact, that is, the correspondence of the phraseology, taken in connection with the specific declaration in the Article that it contains "nothing new," and also in connection with the specific declaration, that the Confession contains no doctrine inconsistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church—the phraseology, the two declarations and the verba ipsissima make out a case that can be met only on the supposition that the Confessors deceived themselves and meant to deceive their adversaries-a supposition that undermines our confidence in the Confession and places us in a fatal dilemma when we come to subscribe it.

#### IV. THE CATHOLIC WRITERS.

Here we must necessarily confine ourselves to a few names. But we have chosen those of greatest authority.

Let us begin with Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who asks: "Is man able of himself to prepare himself for grace without the external assistance of grace?" After argueing the question pro et contra he says: "Conclusion—Man is not of himself able to be prepared for receiving the light of divine grace, but he needs the assistance of God graciously moving within and inspiring a good purpose; but for working meritoriously, and for rightly enjoying God he needs the habitual gift of grace itself, which is the beginning of so great work." Then after further discussion he says: "Whence it is evident that man is not able to prepare himself for receiving the light of grace, except through the gracious assistance of God moving within.

"In the first place then it must be declared that the conversion of man to God is effected through Free-will; and accordingly it is enjoined upon him to turn himself to God. But Free-will cannot be turned to God, except God turn it to himself (Jer. 31:18): Convert me and I shall be converted, because thou art my God; and (Lam. ult. 21): Convert us, O Lord, to thee and we shall be converted.

"Secondly, it must be declared that man is not able to do anything, except he be moved by God (John 15:5): Without me ye can do nothing. Hence when man is said to do what is in himself, this is said to be in man's power in so far as he is moved by God.

"Thirdly, it must be declared, because of that objection about habitual grace, since every form requires a susceptible disposition. But that man may be moved by God, that does not require some other motion, since God is *primum movens*. Wherefore we are not required to go on ad infinitum.

"Fourthly, it must be declared that it is of man to prepare the mind, since he does this through Free-will; but he does not do this without the assistance of God moving and drawing to himself."

On the question, "Can man rise from sin without the assistance of grace?" Aquinas "concludes:" "The natural reason in man is not a sufficient beginning of spiritual soundness, but grace itself, which was taken away by sin; it cannot be effected that man of himself can rise from sin, that is, can be restored to those things which he lost by sinning."\*

Thus Thomas Aquinas affirms the existence of Free-will, as does also our Article; and they both affirm the need of grace and of assistance and of the divine operation, before man can

begin to do, or can do, anything good.

We now go to Peter Lombard whose Sententiae was the theological text-book of the later Middle Ages. Luthardt says that the following sounds entirely Augustinian: "The Will or work of man does not invite the grace of God, but grace itself precedes (praevenit) the Will by preparing, so that it may will the good, and assists it when it has been prepared, in order that it may perform."

<sup>\*</sup>Summa Theologica, Tom. Tertius, Prim. Sec. 2, 109, VI., VII. † Die Lehre von Freien Willen, p. 60.

The Lombard further says: "God precedes him who is unwilling, that he may will, and follows him who wills that he may not will in vain"—which is identical with a famous dictum of Augustine. Also: "It is evident therefore from what has been said that the Will of man per se does not will the good efficaciously without the grace of God: For grace precedes, no merit calling it forth, as Augustine says: No human merit precedes the grace of God, but it deserves to be increased, that when it is increased it may merit and be perfected by the will following, not leading." He also declares that the "Arbitrium is set free alone by the grace of God, which has its foundation in Christ, so that the Will may be prepared."\*

And in commenting on the passage: It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy' he says: "The will of man alone does not suffice, if there be not also the mercy of God. Conversely it is said: The mercy of God also does not suffice, if there be not also the will of man. In this way it is rightly said, because the will of man alone is not sufficient. Why, on the contrary, is it not also rightly said: It is not of God that showeth mercy, but of man who willeth, since the mercy of God alone does not suffice? For man will not be able to believe or hope, unless he will, nor come to the palm, unless he run by the Will. It remains therefore that rightly said it may be understood that all may be given to God, who precedes the good will of man. and prepares it, and prepares it to be assisted, and assists it when it has been prepared. He precedes him who is unwilling that he may will and follows him who is willing that he may not will in vain. Behold by these words and by other promises it is clearly taught, because the will of man is prepared and preceded by the grace of God, that it may will the good, and assisted that it may not will in vain." The Suffice it to say that this passage is taken almost bodily from Augustine, who is generally supposed to be orthodox on the doctrine of the Will.

<sup>\*</sup> Sententiae, II., XXV-XXVII. Migne.

<sup>†</sup> Ut supra, XXVI, Migne, p. 710.

We come next to St. Bernard who wrote a tractate on Grace and Free-will. He says: "Give glory to God who by grace hath preceded thee, hath excited, hath initiated. Two things are necessary for me: To be taught and to be assisted." in that famous passage in which he asks: "What then does Free-will do? I answer briefly. It is saved. Take away Free-will and there will be nothing to be saved. Take away grace and there will be nothing by which to be saved. This work cannot be done without the two: The one by whom it is done; the other to whom or in whom it is done." He declares that salvation cannot be effected "without the consent of him who accepts, and without the grace of him who gives."\* Suffice it to say here that this passage is quoted with approbation by Roman Catholic scholars and by many of the most eminent Lutheran doctors. He has a chapter entitled: "What is to be attributed to grace, and what to Free-will in the matter of salvation?" He says that "God works in us to the good to will it. to perform it. The first without us; the second with us; the third through us. \* \* \* Undoubtedly the beginning of our salvation is made by God, not by ourselves or with ourselves. But the consent and work, though not from us, are yet not without us." "Grace works with Free-will, since in the first thing it precedes it; in other things it attends."†

The point to be emphasized in the teaching of St. Bernard on the subject in hand is the marked similarity in the use of the very words in pivotal statements that are subsequently employed by Melanchthon in the *Excursus* and in the Confession. The thought is the same. Man has Free-will, but man's volluntas must be assisted and stimulated by divine grace, before it can realize the Kingdom of heaven in itself. "By God's assistance the inward man is renewed day by day."

Gregory the Great has a section that begins as follows: "The harmony of prevenient Grace and Free-will following. Because when divine grace precedes and our Free-will follows we

† Ibid. pp. 1396-7.

<sup>\*</sup> Opera, vol. I. pp. 1365-7. Paris edition, 1839.

are said to free ourselves, we who consent to God who frees us. Yet not I, but the grace of God with me. For inasmuch as he had followed the prevenient grace of God in himself through Free will, he properly adds: With me." \* Again: " He (God) by quickening precedes us that we may will; by assisting follows that we may not will in vain, but may be able to accomplish what we will. Therefore when grace precedes and the good will follows that which is the gift of the omnipotent God becomes our merit. This Paul briefly explains, saying: More abundantly than all others have I labored. That he might not seem to attribute to his own strength what he had done, he adds: Yet not I, but the grace of God with me. Because he was preceded by the heavenly gift, he regarded himself apart from his own work, saying: Yet not I. But because prevenient grace had made the Will in him free for the good, by which Free will he had followed the same grace in the work, he added: But the grace of God in me. As though he had said: In a good work I have labored, not I, but also I. In this that I have been preceded by God, not I. In this that I have followed the gift by the Will, also I. Therefore having spoken those words against Pelagius and Coelestius, let us

Here three things are very clear: Man has Free will; every good work must be preceded by the grace of God; that the Will can do good works when preceded and assisted by divine grace. Also Pelagianism is expressly repudiated. The case is not more strongly put in the Confession.

We come next to Prosper of Aquitaine. He also expressly repudiates Pelagianism. He declares that "the beginning, the progress and the perseverence in the good to the end is the gift of God. Since the supports of divine grace are the foundations of the human will." "We pray of our own Will, yet it is God who sends the Spirit into our hearts. If we speak anything that is pious, it is the Spirit of our Father who speaks in us. If we work out our salvation, it is God who works in

return to the order of exposition." †

<sup>\*</sup> Migne, LXXVI. p. 299.

<sup>†</sup> Migne, LXXVI. pp., 870-1.

us. \* \* Free-will bestowed naturally upon man remains in nature; but its quality and condition are changed by the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who turns the Will itself from that which it was perversely willing, so that, affected with delight, purified by faith, encouraged by hope, warmed by love, it might accept a free service, and cast away the servile liberty."\* He says that it "God does not work in us we can be partakers of no good work," and that "neither the learned nor the unlearned are led to God by the human reason; but every man who is converted to God is first moved by the grace of God."†

Thus have we quoted from a few writers in the Roman Church. It would be easy to fill scores of pages with quotations of similar or of identical import. Of the writers whom we have quoted, and of the Roman writers in general, it can be said that they expressly repudiate Pelagianism, which the Confession did not do in the form in which it was read before the Emperor. Moreover, these writers largely reproduce Augustine, who has been and still is recognized by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike as a standard teacher in the Church, though neither Catholics nor Protestants have accepted the entire Augustine, for Augustine, though a profound, was not a consistent, thinker. He not unfrequently contradicts himself: but it is not a difficult matter to strike a balance and thus to get an accurate conception of his meaning. He taught the existence in man of Free-will, the need of grace to stimulate Free-will into activity in spiritual things, but also the activity of the Will or of man while being divinely assisted, as is plainly evident from the quotations made already above directly from his works, and indirectly through Peter Lombard and others. Moreover, it is from him, chiefly, and also, in part, from Prosper, that we have the Chapters t on Grace and Free-will in the Second Council of Orange (529), which has

<sup>\*</sup> Migne L.I. pp. 264-5.

<sup>†</sup> Migne LI. pp. 654-5.

<sup>‡</sup> Hefele, History of the Councils, Vol. IV., p. 151 et seqq.

"the authority of an Ecumenical Council," \* and which is appealed to by Catholics and also by Lutheran writers on the subject now in hand.

What now does this Council say on the subject Of Grace and Free-will? It rejects both Pelagianism and Semipelagianism, affirms the antecedent operation of grace in the order of salvation, and denies that man can consent to the truth without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It declares that the growth, as also the beginning, of faith, and the disposition for faith, are wrought in us by grace. But the precedence and activity of grace do not vacate the activity of Freewill, for it is said expressly: " As oft as we do good God works in us and through us in order that we may work. Even the regenerate and the saints must ever implore the assistance of God in order that they may reach the good end and persevere in a good work;" and then almost in the very words of our Article: "We ought to preach and believe that through the sin of the first man Free-will has become deteriorated and attenuated [Mark: not destroyed], so that no one is thereafter able to love God, as he ought, or to believe in God, or to do on God's account what is good, except the grace of the divine mercy shall have preceded him."

This teaching the Council declared to be that of the Scriptures, and "to accord with the Catholic faith, because when grace is received by baptism all who have been baptized, by the assistance and cooperation of Christ, are able and ought, if they will, to labor faithfully to do those things which pertain to salvation." †

It remains only to say two things about this Council: (a) It rejects under anathema the doctrine that any are predestinated to evil by the divine power, and (b) its decrees are quoted as authoritative on the doctrine of Free-will by Catholic writers from the date of its ratification by Pope Bonifacius (530 or 531) to the present day.

<sup>\*</sup> Thomasius, Dogmengeschichte, I., p.

<sup>†</sup> Mansi, Concilia, 8. pp. 711 et segg.

## V. THE LATER ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS.

Let us begin with Dr. John Eck, whose Enchiridion (we quote from the edition of 1549) was written "against Luther and other enemies of the Church." Dr. Eck says: "We confess that Free will of itself alone is not able for the good, and is nothing, but the grace of God makes it able for something. Therefore no man of himself thinks anything good but by the special grace of God. They (the Catholics) declare that this is to be understood not only of the grace which makes acceptable to God, but also of the the antecedent gracious motion by which God quickens and draws. Hence we must carefully consider what is of God alone and what is of God and Free-will." He declares that the Fathers constantly affirm that "grace is necessary, yea, grace must precede the operation of Free-will."

Andrew Fabricius, in his Harmony of the Augsburg Confession, says: "In the Confession which was presented to the Emperor they argue about Free will in such a way as at the same time to affirm that man is able to perform not only civil, but also spiritual righteousness when the Holy Spirit assists and renews his infirmity. So have the Catholics always taught," p. 201.

John a Deventer, after quoting the essential portion of the article on Free-will in the Apology, says: "Now you hear how much these concede to Free-will. Turn over and over all the writings of the Catholics, and may I die, if more has been attributed by ours to Free-will than these attribute to it. It is wrong to compare Catholics to the Pelagians; it is a mistake to say that Catholics teach that man is able to love God above all things and to keep the commandments of God so as to merit grace." *Ibid.* p. 292.

John Cochlaeus, in discussing Article XVIII. of the Confession, says: "Both sides (Catholics and Lutherans) condemn those who teach that man by his own powers of nature is able to keep the Commandments of God as to the substance of the act." Again: "He (man) is not able to do the substance of the act without some aid from God. For it is God in whom we

live and are moved and are. He is primus motor, primus actus, primum, without whom there can be no movement in man, no act, nothing, no nature, no substance. He has all from God. He owes to him his powers, nature itself, everything. For what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Do not therefore fail to use thy powers, which were not given thee for no purpose." Ibid. p. 293.

John Hoffmeister, writing also on Article XVIII., says: "This Article does not offend us, neither do we interpret it in an evil sense; it seems to have been taken from the writings of the holy fathers, yea, even from the Holy Scriptures." Then he quotes from Augustine as follows: "Free-will is captive and has power only to sin. It has no power for righteousness unless it be set free and assisted by God. The grace of God, as he elsewhere writes, precedes him who is unwilling that he may will, and follows him when he wills that he may not will in vain." He then quotes Bucer as confessing candidly that all the ancient and modern (Catholic) theologians teach that "Free-will, unless it be moved and assisted by God, has no power for good." \*

Now the things to be noted here are that these four Roman Catholic theologians, all contemporaries of the Reformation, approve the eighteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, just as the Confutators had done, and declare that said Article presents the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, and this declaration they establish by quotations from and references to the works of the Fathers, especially to those of Augustine.

It would be a humilating confession of weakness on our part, and a bald case of *petitio principii*, for us to say that these men were ignorant of the meaning of the writings of the Fathers, or that they were destitute of honor, of conviction, of truth in the inward parts, or that they had been deceived and were trying to deceive others; and certainly they were not courting favor from the Lutherans, for in the strongest language they condemn the Determinism of Luther and of Melanchthon.

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid. p. 294.

VI. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND MODERN ROMAN CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS.

It is commonly understood that the Council of Trent (1545-1563) chrystalized the scholastic, and in part the patristic, theology in its Decrees and Canons. In Session Sixth, Chap. VI., we read: "Now they (adults) are disposed unto said justice when, excited and assisted by divine grace, conceiving faith by hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which God has revealed and promised;" and in Canon III. of the same session: "If any one saith, that without the prevenient grace of the Holy Spirit, and without his help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent as he ought, so that the grace of justification can be bestowed upon him, let him be anathema."

J. P. Migne in Theologiae Cursus Completus (28 large quarto vols.) "drawn chiefly from the bishops and theologians of Catholic Europe," says: "Free-will, moved and excited by God to good works, acts with the grace of God and from that grace; but it is not merely passive, or moved as something inanimate, a heresy which was condemned by the Council of Trent." He then quotes Augustine and other Fathers to the effect that only when man is excited, moved, and assisted by grace, is he able to act freely.\* He also says: "Man's Freewill, while it assents to God moving and exciting, is also able to dissent if it wills." And again, "No Catholic dare affirm that man's Free-will, without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is able to believe, to hope, to repent or to work as it ought, in order that it may merit the grace of justification or eternal life. For it is God who in all our good actions works in us both to will and to do."

Cardinal Perrone was one of the most learned and one of the most orthodox Roman Catholic theologians of the nineteenth century. In his *Praelectiones Theologicae* he condemns the doctrine of the Pelagians and that of the Semipelagians on Free-will. He lays down the proposition and defends and forti-

<sup>\*</sup> Vol. VI. pp. 66-70.

fies it by quotations from the Councils of Trent and Orange, that "without the illumination, inspiration and operation of the Holy Spirit, man is not able to have a salutary beginning of faith, though the Semipelagians contend to the contrary." After quoting from the Councils of Trent and Orange passages which we have quoted above he proceeds: "According to the Scriptures faith and the beginning of it are to be attributed not only to preaching, or to the illumination, but to the internal operation, of the Holy Spirit, who illumines and inspires; also perseverence in the same faith, since they teach that no one can come to Christ except the Father draw him, and that faith is the gift of God, which is granted only out of mercy and grace, so that no one may boast." In support of this proposition Perrone quotes numerous passages of Scripture, and also from the Greek and Latin Fathers.\*

Our last quotation is made from A Manual of Catholic Theology by Wilhelm and Scannel, published in 1898 under the Imprimatur of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Our book says: "The Canons of this council (Orange) set forth the doctrine of the Church [mark the five last words] as follows: Grace is not given simply because we ask for it; in order to free us from sin. God does not produce an act of our Will, but the desire to be freed is wrought in us by the infusion of the Holy Ghost; the beginning of faith, the pious willingness to believe, is not in us naturally, but is itself a gift of grace, an infusion of the Holy Ghost; to the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Ghost are also due the initial acts of believing, willing, desiring, striving, seeking, asking; by the mere forces of nature nothing positively leading up to the eternal life can be thought of (ut expedit), or chosen without the illumination of the Holy Spirit; not only a tew, but all require Divine mercy to come to the grace of baptism." Then after condemning the doctrine of Luther in the De Servo Arbitrio, and of Calvin, and those of the Pelagians and Semipelagians our book declares that "the necessity of grace for the performance

<sup>\*</sup> Vol. II., pp. 164-5.

ot salutary acts, either before or after justification, is physical, absolute and unconditional."\*

Here now we begin for the present to rest our pen—not because the subject is exhausted, nor because materials have failed, but because our space is growing small. The quotations are indeed brief and few in number, but they are representative, as taken in part from official standards and in part from the most authoritative writers in the Roman Catholic Church, and they extend through a period of nearly fifteen hundred years.

We do not contend that these standards and these writers teach de libero arbitrio in a sense that is verbally and literally identical, but in a sense that is identical in substance of doctrine and in conception. They profess to state and to represent, and they do state and represent, the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject before us, and they state it and represent it with as much consensus as the Lutheran dogmaticians state and represent many a fundamental doctrine in the Lutheran Confession. The kind of doctrine, the species, is identical. The form differs. The fundamental predicates The negations are the same. These standards and writers affirm without variation that man has Free will by nature, and that this Free-will was not destroyed or lost by sin; that without prevenient grace, without the assistance of God, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit man cannot have faith, nor even the beginning of faith. They in effect affirm with Peter Lombard that " before grace the Will is free to do evil, and that by grace it is made free to do good; that it is always in some sense free, but not always good. For it is not good unless it has been set free from sin, and yet it is free from necessity." And without exception, either by implication or ex expresso, they reject Pelagianism and Semipelagianism, Manichaeism and Determinism.

We conclude, therefore, that Article XVIII. of the Augustana is justified in declaring that it contains nothing new, nothing that has not been recognized as sound doctrine in the Catholic and in the Roman Church, and that the Epilogue to the Prin-

<sup>\*</sup> Vol. II., pp. 236 et seqq.

[Apr.

224

cipal Articles of faith is justified, in so far as our Article is concerned (the other Articles are not now in the purview), when it declares that "there is nothing that differs from the Roman Church, in so far as it is known from writers."

The distinct affirmations of the Article are: That man has Free-will. So say the Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic writers. That without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit, man can perform no spiritual righteousness. So say the Catholic Church and the writers of the Roman Catholic Church. Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

The Catholic Church as known from her official standards and from her standard writers has never taught that in conceiving taith, in conversion, or in keeping the Commandments, or in working spiritual righteousness, man holds himself pure passivè or that he is "like a block," or "worse than a block," or " only subjectum convertendum," or is " subjectum patiens." Let him who contends that Article XVIII. of the Augsburg Confession teaches, and was meant by its author to teach, that in conceiving faith, or in conversion, or in keeping the command. ments, or in doing spiritual righteousness, man holds himself pure passive, and that he is "like a block "etc., -let him who so contends prove his contention by lawful methods of historico -critical exegesis, and by comparisons with anything ever written by Melanchthon on the subject of Free-will after the year 1527. And when he shall have succeeded, or thinks he has succeeded, then let him draw the conclusion necessarily involved in his proof, or supposed proof, that the Confession, as regards Article XVIII., has borne false witness twice, for it is demonstrably certain that the pure passive-" stock"-" stone" -" subjectum convertendum" doctrine of the Will is something " new" in the Church of Jesus Christ-" new," not only in degree, but in kind. And let him who would champion the pure passive etc., explanation of Article XVIII., draw the further necessary conclusion from his premises, that every time he subscribes the Confession he also bears false witness, unless he makes specific protest against what the Article says about itself as containing "nothing new" and against the declaration of the Epilogue that the doctrinal Articles "contain nothing that differs from the Scriptures, or from the Catholic Church, or from the Roman Church, in so far as it is known from writers."

TO BE CONCLUDED.

## ARTICLE V.

# SHALL WE SUPPLEMENT THE CATECHISM?

BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.

So far as the Church exists for herself alone, she must prove a failure. Selfishness always ends in destruction. While externally, from extraneous causes, she can never be destroyed, internally, through subjective atrophy, she may approach the brink of ruin. History has several times found her in such danger that she was saved from further disintegration only through revivification of the Holy Spirit. But when her condition is normal, she is safest. To this end it is necessary to keep in view her divine purpose and final goal. Her aim is the salvation of the world. Without this mission, the Church would be a fine holiness association, ultimately settling down into a social crystal as beautiful as it would be lifeless. But she dare not be simply a thing to be admired. She must be an agency of power—the chief institutional force in the world.

It was near the hour of his ascension that Christ gave his disciples the great commission to baptize and to teach all the nations (Matt. 28: 16ff). This is the last, though not the dying, behest of the Head of the Church. He being no longer visibly here, his followers, the whole body of believers, are his representatives, even his vicegerents, on earth, to espouse his cause and to bring the nations into saving relation with him. It is the duty of this unique society to offer the boon of redemption to the lost race and to persuade individuals to accept it. Men are to enter the ark for their own safety, only in turn to become rescuers of their fellows. It is thus that the Church

is to remain an active, personal power in the world,—not a crystal without force, but an organism pulsating with life.

Ot course, the paramount motive is love. Yet we must also keep our own life vigorous and recruit our numbers. While we are adding to our company such as are being saved, we are at the same time saving ourselves from formalism and from extinction. Every soul, snatching brands from the burning, either saves itself from the consuming fire, or, at least, by every such altruistic effort removes itself further from peril. Or, to change the figure, the congregation, like the Alpine monks and their St. Bernard dogs, keeps herself warm by digging lost travelers out of the snow and restoring them in her charitable hospice.

The question as to who are the subjects of the Church's operations is easily answered. The great principle which Peter enunciated at Pentecost ("For to you is the promise and to your children," Acts 2: 39), though it was no new doctrine, has done incalculable good to the people of God, and through them to the world. It made the family a unit in the kingdom of Christ, as it had been in the theocratic commonwealth of Israel. The Messianic society, like that of the synagogue, was to have its principal growth through internal development. The children of the Christian home were to be trained for the Church. When the adults, who were converted at Pentecost and elsewhere, were confronted by the problem concerning the relation of their offspring to the kingdom of Christ, they soon understood it, and did not hesitate to baptize them into the new covenant. Thus the second generation of primitive believers greatly accelerated the expansion of Christianity and gave homogeneous character to its membership. From that time to the present, and never more so than now, have the great historic denominations made it their first care to rear the little ones for the sanctuary. But every community has an unchurched, and an unevangelized, perhaps a floating, population. Some of these people may be at least suspicious of, if not hostile to the Church. Most of them are only indifferent. Some may be skeptics; hardly any are atheists. Likely a few of them are already on the night-tracks of Nicodemus that lead toward the morning. These "other sheep which are not of this fold" (Ino. 10: 16) we must also bring in. The evangelization of these people, and indeed of every individual in the vicinage, certainly is the mission of each congregation. Except in the case of Jonah, the Hebrew prophets carried no message to those who were aliens to Israel. Our calling is not so exclusive. The scope of our ministry is not so provincial. But even the later Iews, through the influence of the diaspora. won many proselytes. However, the Christian Church is first of all a priestess of home culture and a neighborhood propagandist. "Beginning at Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:47), it goes from door to door, and thus spreads the sparks and carries the torch from hearth to hearth, until the entire hamlet, and finally the nation is warmed and illumined. It is thus that the Gospel leavens the whole lump. Such is the principle of its expansion. Such was the teaching and prophecy of the Christ (Lk. 13:19).

Moreover, the congregation or religious body that is not interested in the conversion of the heathen in other lands is false to its trust and already by that fact manifests signs of decrepitude. Not to be active in the work of Foreign Missions is a moribund condition. The horizon of faith is that of a world-sphere. The Church is not a garrison in winter quarters, indulging in ease, but an army on the march, campaigning for the glory of Immanuel and the good of man. Edification of the body within, aggressive evangelization without, this must be the program of the Church of Christ on earth.

When we come to the subject of methods one can have his choice. In themselves they are matters of indifference. The best are not universally successful. We are not to depend upon them, It is the Gospel itself, not the mode of its application, that is the power of God unto salvation to them that believe (Rom. 1:16). Only the two main general methods of saving men concern us here—the revivalistic and the educational. According to revivalism there never is a normal state of the Church when believers are constantly growing in grace and in

the knowledge of Christ (2 Pet: 3: 18). It maintains that the Church must be stirred up now and then. Christian experience accordingly must not flow on steadily, like a deep river constantly distributing blessing along its banks. Rather must it take on the character of spring freshets, with roar and rush It will not take for granted that children can love Christ from infancy and never know anything except the peace of God. Even the lambs of the flock according to revivalism must be able to point to a time and place when the divine life in them was kindled. Its advocates usually have very cloudy ideas of the origin of religion in the soul, and are culpably silent about the means of grace. They forget the teaching of. the Word on the subject (Ecc. 11:5. Jn. 3:5,8). With them the kingdom of God must come with observation (Lk. 17: 20). Sight is more controlling than faith. The predominant temper of revivalism is emotional; its habitual manner is sensational.

At its worst, the system is a school of heresy and fanaticism; at its best it is an artificial phase of religious life, and gives altogether erroneous impressions of genuine religious experience. However, the writer would be far from saying that a true revival never is possible or necessary. The history of the Church proves that often an abnormal state of things existed, when the remnant of the vitally pious could only cry, "O Lord, revive thy work in the midst of years!" (Hab. 3:2). Not to note instances in the Old Testament, or to speak of the Retormation, we wish to mention as illustrations two such epochs in the United States,

A few years after Muhlenberg came to this country (1742), an organist and teacher by the name of Mittelberger followed him (1750). After spending five years here, he returned to Germany and wrote a book on his "Journey to Pennsylvania." On page 54, speaking of the religious status of the people, he says: "But there are many unbaptized souls there that do not even wish to be baptized. Many pray neither in the morning, neither in the evening, neither before or after meals. No devotional books, not to speak of the Bible, will be found with such people."

On page 63, he describes the ministry. "Most preachers are hired by the year like the cowherds of Germany; and if one does not preach to their likeing, he must expect to be served with a notice that his services will no longer be required. It is, therefore, very difficult to be a conscientious preacher, especially as they have to bear and suffer so much from so many hostile and often wicked sects. The most exemplary preachers often are reviled, insulted and scoffed at like the Jews, by the young and old, especially in the country. I would, therefore, rather perform the meanest herdsman's duties in Germany, than be a preacher in Pennsylvania."

We confess that such a state of things, which, in its chief features, as other competent witnesses of those times have testified, is not overdrawn, justified a revival. History records that it came, and that Muhlenberg was one of the revivalists.

In The Winning of the West, President Roosevelt (vol. VI., p. 173) describes the great revival of religion which swept over the Middle West in 1799. He says; "It was accompanied by scenes of great excitement. Under the conditions of a vast wooded wilderness and a scanty population, the camp-meeting was evolved as the typical religious festival. To the great camp-meetings the frontiersmen flocked from far and near, on foot, on horseback, and in wagons. Every morning at daylight the multitude was summoned to prayer by sound of trumphet. No preacher or exhorter was suffered to speak unless he had the power of stirring the souls of his hearers. The preaching, the praying, and the singing went on without intermission, and under the tremendous emotional stress whole communities became fervent professors of religion." He also records (p. 174): "Often men backslid, and to a period of intense emotional religion succeeded one of utter unbelief and of reversion to the worst practices which had been given up. Nevertheless, on the whole there was an immense gain for good."

Now, any one who has read the history of those times and of that region will understand how the conditions preceding 1799 prepared the way for such an advent. But a certain class

of evangelists afterwards made a fetich of the "mourner's bench," and they have tried ever since to perpetuate it, as though the same results could take place under entirely different circumstances. Revivalism can not be made the normal life of the Church. It is not a state; it is a spasm. Happily all the great historic denominations have learned this fact and are using their knowledge to sustain a healthier spiritual condition. The Presbyterian Church, in its early history in this country, was revivalistic; while not repudiating evangelistic effort, it is now far from being so. The Methodists, who first of all are responsible for this modern method, are to-day everywhere looking about for something better. The telling fact is that at this present time there is not in all the world a single Christian denomination that begins mission work in foreign lands with the introduction of the revival system. As the soul mode of saving mankind and building up the kingdom of God. it is a demonstrated failure. Reaction from its high pressure always breeds rationalism.

We turn from the further consideration of revivalism to the Educational System. This method has its roots in apostolic times and customs.

There was only one Pentecost. Only one was promised; only one is possible (Dr. Kuyper, Work of the Holy Spirit, p. 112). Ever since that wonderful outpouring, the Spirit abides in the Church (Jno. 14: 16). The Apostles' Creed is but an outgrowth of the first catechetical classes formed of the applicants for baptism (Seeberg vol. I. p. 85). From that time for seventeen hundred years, Christendom knew nothing of any but the educational method for evangelizing the world and edifying the congregation. To-day three-fourths of professing Christians on earth do not dream of employing any other. What is it, and how does it differ from its rival? It takes the child in the cradle, baptizes it, rears it in a religious home, where it is taught by example and precept to lisp its prayer, to love Jesus, and to understand the rudiments of our faith.

It soon finds its way to Sunday-school, for further instruction and training. The pastor, also, finally takes charge of it, and at a youthful age it is admitted to the Lord's Supper, by the rite of Confirmation. This is the normal process. It is an ideal upon which, in the abstract, no improvement can be In practice, however, it often fails of full realization. One or the other step is missed, and thus partial failure is the result. Especially is this so in the case of those who grew up in the non-churchly families, to say nothing of the altogether worldly, heathenish, and ungodly. Over against the revival system this is slower, gradual, and more disciplinary. It drills its soldiers, before it asks them to go into battle. It adopts the Biblical norm of "first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn." It takes up blades in Christ, no matter what their age, and brings them up in the fear and admonition of the Lord. It is thoroughly convinced that to grow in grace and in the knowledge of Christ is the best way to produce spiritual character. Indubitably, only so far as revival denominations have adopted this method, have they ever conserved the results of their operations. Many a wild-fire "rousement" has ended in smoke, either because its fanatical promoters knew of no means to preserve what they had gained, or were too bigoted to use them. This is why there are certain so-called "burnt districts," in which an entire generation must pass away before sanity is restored.

Every denomination that fosters Sunday-schools, Young People's Societies, Bible Conference, and institutions of learning, confesses that the educational system of religion is the hope of the world. The Zwickau prophets and their deluded followers finally gave up their Schwärmerei and became the modern, staid and undemonstrative Menonites, who as a rule eschew all factitious and artificial methods of revivalism. The influence of Moody, the greatest evangelist of the age, has been perpetuated only through the educational agencies, which he was wise enough to establish. Revivalism always is, and from the nature of the case must be, a substitute.

It will, however, be to little purpose to carry comparisons any further. The revival method is good under certain circum-

stances and up to a certain point. The educational method is superior as a working rule.

As a consequence our Church should never adopt, as a rule of practice, a system so alien to her genius, as revivalism, technically so called. As a lesson and warning, the experience of the New York Ministerium may suffice. "Methodistic measures were introduced and used by the great majority of pastors. whilst the instruction of the young was neglected. Pastors and churches followed in the wake of that which was then popular, and in vogue among the surrounding denominations. But this produced a sad state of affairs in the churches. In their parochial reports the more conscientious and observing pastors complain of the mischief this revivalism wrought in the churches. They say they find it extremely difficult to have young persons come to catechetical instruction. attribute this to the practice so widely pursued of admitting persons into church communion who are ignorant of the very first and fundamental truths of the Christian religion. The result was that the churches were languishing. In 1852 Synod took cognizance of this sad fact." (Prof. Nieum, in Luth. Cyc. p. 491). However, despite this caution the very caption of the present article indicates that we are willing to concede that to a degree our method often tails to gather in all the souls in a given neighborhood. We have likewise seen the other method employed during a series of years in certain localities. The result was that one-third of the population was converted, one-third was composed of backsliders, and the last third was infidels or immoral. Revivalism alone never regenerated an entire community. With regard to the catechetical method. the case is not so discouraging. Nevertheless, even where it meets with no opposition, there are found some backsliders, some dwarfed nominal church-members, some scapegraces, and some who have not yet reached the point of confessing Christ.

The question, therefore, arises: After catechisation has been employed to its utmost without bringing in all the baptized children of the Church, to say nothing of them that are without, shall we supplement it?

In the first place, every community contains a quota of souls that never will be saved. The personal, visible presence of Jesus himself would not turn them. They have darkness rather than light. They are joined to their idols, stiffen their necks, and harden their hearts. They act as though they had been predestinated to damnation. Practically, as far as such people are concerned, the pagan doctrine of fate or that of the baldest Calvanism might as well be true. Yet we know that the Heavenly Father did all for them that he did for others. • Yet they only resist. They will not stand up to be helped; they will not even lie down to be carried. When we follow them, they run away; when we pray for them, they curse. They are moral degenerates. In spite of all we may do, their miserable souls will be lost. For their salvation the Church will not be held responsible. By no method would they be saved. Consequently, when catechization has failed to reach this class, all supplementary schemes will be useless. In such cases we need worry only, if we have not done our whole duty. Therefore, we should do it, for only the end can reveal the result.

Some years ago in certain communities, where the socalled "new measure" idea prevailed, pastors would follow up each catechetical course with a special revival effort. The wrong idea thus arose that the young people attended the class to learn, but that they had to go to "the meeting" to be converted. Some of these mode-worshipers, who would have fainted at sight of a liturgy, to them the sign of ritualism, have told the writer, "O, catechization is a good thing, if afterward you are converted." But the idea that any one could be converted while attending the class never occurred to them! Therefore, the pastor who would supplement his catechetical work with evangelistic meetings should make it plain that the series is not especially for those who were catechumens, but for those who were not. If they have been taught to trust in Christ alone for justification, their simple faith should not be confused by the addition of an extra burden, which is the case when catechumens are made to feel that they dare not be satisfied, unless

they have yet "come out" in meeting. We know of cases where catechumens forsook the class, became penitents at a neighboring revival, and then returned to the pastor and demanded the communion without confirmation, on the ground that they now were converted and needed neither instruction nor useless ceremony! According to Prof. M. Loy's autobiography, Dr. Sprecher, in Harrisburg (1836), reversed this order and transformed a revival meeting into a catechetical class. This we believe to be a better plan. Yet no a priori argument can be successfully brought against special and even protracted, services, in which by means of the Gospel, preached and sung, and unusual personal effort, the salvation of the lost is attempted. Weeks of prayer and Passion Week may be occasions for such work. But former confirmants should be the active laborers, not the subjects of such movements. However, instances are not wanting wherein congregations acted as though they had two classes of Christians-catechism and special service members—and the latter became a little esoteric circle within the flock, supposed by some to have more vital piety than the rest. This evil must be avoided by the proper teaching that there is no virtue in modes. So-called experimental religion often leads to spiritual pride. In any case, the pastor must be his own evangelist (2 Tim. 4:5).

No one else can take his place. The influence which a stranger brings also again goes out with him. It is not said that another may not profitably expound the Scriptures by preaching, or Bible readings, but the pastor must not vacate his office. Even the *Teaching of the Twelve* (110 A. D) makes provision to put a hedge around traveling evangelists. With the best motives they may easily destroy more than they can build up. Synods do not want to feel answerable for them. But if a pastor can use them for his own ends, he may possibly reap the fruits of their sowing. However, as a rule, the result of the transient preacher have been disappointing. Whatever supplementary efforts are to glean after faithful catechization, it is best that the pastor and his people do the work themselves. What he cannot accomplish, perhaps other denomina-

tions may do. What neither he nor they can effect, must abide God's own time or remain undone forever.

Too much emphasis can not be placed upon the fact that much depends upon the locality of one's work. We sometimes criticise a brother for doing in his parish what, upon an exchange of places, we ourselves would do. The rural pastor can not operate exactly as does the urban, and especially not as the metropolitan minister. Much good may be done by the technically called "institutional church," which tries to reach the soul through the athletic, aesthetic, social, literary, histrionic, musical, and even the dietetic tastes of men. There are many homeless young people in our large cities who must be attracted in some way which will supply them with at least the substitute of a hearth-stone and the Church. Woe to that town in which the saloon is the most sociable public place, and where the warmest welcome is extended in the club rooms! Let us have all the "institutions" and "settlements" that will help to bring about the regeneration of the human race.

In every community there are older people who have grown up under influences adverse to our educational system. With. out any fault of their own, they are outside of the Church. They have arrived at man's or woman's estate, perhaps without having been baptized. The ministers of a former age would not admit these to church fellowship without going through a course of instruction. For the sake of example this was probably the safer plan. Because no elasticity in the mode was allowed, many of this class, who, for instance, had intermarried with our families, did not become of us, though they were disirous of so doing. By relaxing somewhat from the stringent interpretation of our law, the present writer has received no small number of such into the Church through adult baptism or confirmation, without requiring them to sit with the children to learn the simple lessons of the catechism. Private religious instruction also is allowable and may be very fruitful. Thus there should be more than one way of dragging the net and catching men. We can not always be the masters of our environments, because they were created by causes which existed before us and over which we have no control. We must, therefore, make the best of the situation. The very fact that there are others using different methods in the same field is proof that we can not always do as we please. Competition always alters conditions.

To the question then, "Shall we Supplement the Catechism?" an affirmative answer must be given, because it takes for granted that the catechism remains the present, as it has been the historic, norm of the Church. It is to be supplemented, not superseded. But we can not too earnestly warn against a merely formal process of catechization. The purpose of it is not to railroad the children into the congregation and get their names on the record; not to instil a scientific knowledge of religion into their minds; not chiefly to implant the Creed into their memories. They are to be brought to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. They are to become living branches of the Vine bringing forth all the fruits of the Spirit. Anything short of this must be considered a failure spelled large,

There is one form of Christian activity that certainly must supplement catechization, and that is personal effort with individuals. Year in and year out, in season and out of season, not only the pastor but every one of his flock should be seeking the lost. This work must not be limited to the catechetical period of the church-year, or to any other season of special activity. The pastor and congregation must not be warm by spells, but zealous all the time. The powers of evil never sleep, and there is no excuse for ease in Zion. Certainly, if there be no personal activity except during the few weeks of catechization, ground will be lost in the evangelization of the community. In the choice of methods, much may depend upon the environment and customs: but there can be no difference of opinion on the question of constant, vigilant, personal, individual effort.

Of late years much has been written and spoken concerning the unchurched masses of our country. Scarcely any ecclesiastical convention has failed to discuss the subject. It has formed the theme in all city ministerial associations. It has

been the occasion of the fling that Christianity is a failure. Even the "ethical culture" and liberalistic forces have taken up the refrain. It has furnished much material for the fiction of our times. Novels of the socialistic type present a hero who gets out of harmony with the Church and starts out on his own account to regenerate the world. If all the enterprises for the amelioration of the submerged elasses, which are so charmingly depicted in such moral-mission romances as " Robert Elsemere," "The Master Christian," and "In His Steps," and a hundred others, had been realized, then at least Chicago, New York and London would no longer have a tenderloin problem to contend with. Again, if all the statistics of all the soreported wonderful revivals were correct, there would be little to say of unchurched masses. No doubt, there are several unchurched millions in the United States, but to speak of the masses as unchurched is incorrect, for such language leaves the impression that the majority of the population is outside the influence of the sanctuary. More than once has the declaration been made that there are nearly fifty millions of unchurched people in this country. These enormous, but utterly false, figures are produced by a very simple process. The entire population is taken as being about eighty millions; the members of all the denominations are estimated at about thirty millions; the less number is then subtracted from the greater, and thus over half the souls in our country are counted as unchurched. Nothing could be more misleading. In such a census the great army of Sunday-school children, from the cradle-roll to the adult class are placed in the column of the unchurched. This is palpably an unjust classification.

Nevertheless it is true that there are some millions (hardly above twenty) who are as yet unchurched. But this is far from saying that none of these are members of the church, or even that most of them are either indifferent or inimical. Many of them are toreigners and their children, who have not yet had time or opportunity to connect themselves with a Church. Many have located on the wide prairies. Many help to congest our large cities. Not less than seven millions form the home-mission field of the Lutheran Church. No other de-

nomination has anything like such a field and we are cultivating only its border-land. All our own, as well as much of the other material, can be reached with the Catechism. In fact, the greater part of the unchurched population of this country could be more easily gathered into the fold by the educational method than by any other. If only we had the men and the buildings with which to do it, success would be sure. Surely the evangelistic method is making very little headway in our metropolitan centers, though many of its advocates are making praiseworthy efforts. The fact is that the conservative way of the Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Lutherans is much more successful in our teeming city populations. So the voice of the latest religious statistics teaches (see Carroll).

It must be confessed that it is the urban and not the rural congregations that leave most Philistines unsubdued. It is in our cities that the unchurched are massed, and cause most anxious thought. Assuredly, if these multitudes, so deeply in need of the Gospel and yet so indifferent to it, will be saved without the Catechism, if revivalistic schemes can turn them from darkness to light, we must be broad minded enough to rejoice in the good work. If our own methods fail, let us employ a thousand others, borrowed from anywhere, to make our Church efficient in saving souls. Without controversy, unless we yield to the Spirit so that he may reach men and women, he will forsake us and chose other agents to do the work. course, in no case is our high ideal ever reached, but under all circumstances let that not be our fault, but our misfortune. Therefore, after the most painstaking employment of the ancient and usually efficient method of catechization has failed to do all that we had hoped, let it not be discarded, but after and side by side with it, let all legitimate, reasonable and evangelical means be prudently tried, so that, if not all, at least the greatest possible number may be won. As the great apostle said, "To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak; I can become all things unto all men, that I might by all means save some," (I Cor. 9:23). Surely, if we exhaust all the potentialities of planting and watering, God will give the increase.

## ARTICLE VI.

# THE RELIGION OF PALESTINE AT THE TIME OF THE ISRAELITIC CONQUEST.

BY HENRY W. A. HANSON, A.M., B.D.

Though uninteresting and insignificant from the standpoint of material fame and influence, small in size, with a large part of its territory rugged, barren and waste, still Palestine possesses an interest and charm which time intensifies rather than diminishes. In entering upon a study of its past one does so with a feeling of reverence as though conscious of treading upon holy ground. This country has also exerted an influence upon the world's development out of all relation to its size and natural resources.

What Greece was to philosophy and art, what Rome was to Law and government, that Palestine has been to the world of religious life and thought. The great influence subsequently exerted by this small country in the moulding of the world's thought has received renewed interest owing to recent archeological research.

The Children of Israel were in a peculiar sense God's chosen people, who more fully than any other nation of the Orient entered into a knowledge snd appreciation of God's nature and relation to the world. Still we cannot see in Jehovah the God of a mere tribe or race—he was God of the Canaanites and Amorites, though they realized it not, as well as of the Israelites. He exerted his guiding and governing power in Egypt as well as in Israel—he sent his prophets to Phoenecia \* and Nineveh† as well as to Israel.

God reveals himself to mankind in proportion to their ability of comprehending him. The sun shines for all, but some are blind; some see its beauty but imperfectly; while others see more. So in the History of God's revelation of Himself to

<sup>\*</sup> I Kings, 17:8.

<sup>†</sup> Jonah I : 2.

mankind. The "Light of the World" shines for all, but some are spiritually blind and see not, some see but dimly, while others can trace its beauty and live in the sunshine of divine revelation.

God's dealings with man are based upon principles deeper and wider than the range of human comprehension. Still as we study the history of God's revelation of Himself we cannot but feel that there must have been a special sense in which the Children of Israel were to a greater extent than any other people of the Orient capable of comprehending God's truth and will, for God is never arbitrary nor partial. There must at all times have been among them such sainted souls as Simeon \* and the Prophetess Anna, † who by their purity of life, simplicity of faith and devotion to God saved their nation from the depths of sin surrounding them.

As we then enter into a study of the Children of Israel as a nation what could give us a better appreciation of their early history than a study of the religion of the Canaan which the Children of Israel faced when they stood on the banks of the Jordan after the long and bitter journey from the bondage of Egypt?

Our study of the religion of Palestine at the time is practically a study of the religion of the Canaanites, since it was their religion which was predominant, and which at that time was, with a few modifications, the worship of all Palestine and Syria. The Hittites had, upon their southward movement, a religion which was perhaps somewhat different from the Canaanitish rites, yet the influence of the latter upon the Hittites was similiar to the subtle, deadly influence which it also exerted upon Israel. The Hittites conquerors were soon the conquered.

Our sources as to the nature of the religious ideas of Palestine at the time are threefold. We have the religion of Phoenecia, which, being a development of that which their brothers in the interior of Palestine had, would naturally throw much

<sup>\*</sup> Luke 2; 36-38.

<sup>†</sup> Luke 2; 25-35.

light upon the worship of the Canaanites. We have, secondly, the warnings in Scripture which at different times singled out the specific features of the Canaanitish worship in order to enable the Isralites to avoid them. Our third source, modern excations, in a remarkable way supplements and verifies the conceptions which we derive from the two other sources, and while from them all combined we all too often receive but a meager outline of that which we long to see expanded to even the minutest details, we must content ourselves with a study of the facts which we have.

#### I. THE IDEA OF DEITY.

To form a just conception of the Canaanitish worship it is necessary to grasp their idea of deity and their conception of the nature religion. Each country had its own god or gods. These gods of the family and State were the peculiar heritage of each generation, upon whom devolved the sacred duty of guarding their interests and worshipping them with all the zeal and devotion which had characterized the worship of their forefathers. "When a God was spoken of as father and his worshippers as his offspring, the meaning was that the worshippers were literally of his stock, that he and they made up one natural family with reciprocal duties to one another." His duty was to give them good crops, guard their interests and in case of war give them victory. Their duty was to maintain his worship, build him temples and offer sacrifices and incense to him. He was theirs; they were his! There may have been some whose souls caught a glimpse of something higher and better than the low, depraved forms of popular religion, yet if such existed we learn nothing of their existence. Who knows but that even there pious souls arose who strove to turn the eyes of their fellow countrymen heavenward, and who paid for their efforts with their lives? "Religion did not exist for the saving of souls, but for the preservation and welfare of society, and in all that was necessary for this end every man had to take his prescribed part or break with the domestic and political community to which he belonged." Religion was a matter of tribe and State. The individual was only a leaf upon the tree. Though entirely different in every other respect, the Israelitic conception of Jehovah was something similar in this. Israelites looked upon Jehovah as their God. Had He not brought them out of Egypt from the house of bondage, promished at Sinai to be their God, and had He not gone before them in a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night leading them to the land of Promise? He was their shield and protector, and they were his people, who built his temples and offered him sacrifices and worshipped Him. It was centuries later, when the Children of Israel had lost sight of their heavenly mission, and were grovelling in the lust and vice of those about them, shielding themselves with the assurance that Jehovah was their God, and was under obligation to protect them, that Isaiah and Jeremiah thundered out the proclamation that Israel must fall, and that the great unit in religion was the individual and not the State-that religion was a question of the individual soul. Amos put an entirely new interpretation on the doctrine by proclaiming: "Jehovah is indeed your God, and you are his people—as his people you have had superior advantages-of these advantages you have not availed yourselves-but have gone into the depths of sin, as deep as those without your advantages; hence you shall be the first to suffer. Jehovah shall destroy you first of all, since 'to whom much is given, of him much is expected." Such ideas were now undreamt The Moabites had their Chemosh; Damascus its Remmon; Babylon its Nero; Assyria its Assur; and Canaan its Baal; and as long as they offered their appointed sacrifices. built temples, and held the usual feasts, their moral consciousness was entirely at rest. In their idea of Deity there was no conception of any moral requirements. Devotion to a God was utterly divorced from all morality and consisted solely in rites.

A glance at the nature of the Canaanitish worship explains its influence and the reason for its ascendancy. In the first place the cosmopolitan Canaanites, while theoretically worshippers of Baal and Astarte were always willing to add a new God to their Pantheon. They were not like the Hebrews, the

devotees of a single God. This liberality upon their part would naturally facilitate their making friends with other people, and at the same time the lewd nature of their worship, which not only allowed but exalted and gloried in the lowest vices and crimes, made it a temptation and snare to all with whom they came in contact. The chief God of the Canaanites was Baal. Baal was originally looked upon as the God of the Heavens and protector of the Phoenecians and Canaanites. He was the God of creative power, bringing all things to life everywhere.

While this seems to be the primitive idea of Baal, it was changed long before the Children of Israel reached Palestine. At that time Baal was localized—each city had its Baal, as originally each city of the Hittites had its Sutekh as we learn from the treaty between Ramesses IInd, and the Hittite king Khata-sir. Along with this male type of deity there was associated the female, and even as man was the head of the family, so the female deity was subordinate to the male. This chief female deity was Astarte or Ashtoreth. She was looked upon as the great counterpart of Baal. As the great receptive and reproductive principal. Along with these two chief deities there were perhaps many others, but from the Scriptural narrative we are led to believe that these two were the popular deities at the time of the Invasion. We also find many traces of Moloch, whose exact position in the divine world is difficult to ascertain, but of whose worship we treat later.

#### II. NATURE OF WORSHIP.

To speak of the Canaanites as non-religious would be far from just. They were fanactically religious. From every hill incense and the smoke of offerings arose. The shaded groves were the scenes of the most shocking crimes; the temples, of which there seemed but few—the chief place of worship being apparently in the open air—were always thronged, and upon the great feast days, young and old, rich and poor, joined about the altar to worship their gods. The very source of

their ideals, their moral and religious life, were poisoned—hence we could expect but little other than we find.

It seems that the Baal of each city was worshipped chiefly in open air upon the High places or hills. Baal was usually represented by images or statues around which the devotees gathered and before which sacrifices were offered. The exact idea which they entertained concerning this statue is hard to grasp. It is hardly possible that they looked upon this image as of any intrinsic divine power, except as it stood for their god. It was the god's representative or symbol. Any worship before his image was acceptable to the God. Any insult to this image was an insult to the God and was punishable with death.

Often temples were built in honor of Baal, in which his image was placed and in which he was worshipped. As an illustration of the wild fanaticism connected with the worship of Baal we find one of their feasts or demonstrations at Carmel during their contest with Elijah. Four hundred of the priests, or prophets of Baal, as they are termed perhaps to contrast them with Elijah the prophet of Jehovah, gathered together to worship their God and demonstrate his power. In calling upon their god they leaped and danced and slashed themselves with knifes and lances. But while the worship of Baal is often placed alone, it is more frequently connected with the worship of Astarte. The worship of Astarte was characterized by the lowest forms of unchastity. Nude as the counterpart of Baal, as the productive principal, she was worshipped with prostitution and sensuality. She is variously represented as a naked woman with her hands supporting her breasts, sometimes as a woman nursing her babe and occasionally as the modest and retiring Venus de Milo. Like Baal and most frequently with Baal she was worshipped in groves, which thronged with prostitutes who had given up their lives to worship their goddess in the most shameless and vile indecency. In these groves occurred daily the most shocking crimes. Each maiden before marrying must prostitute herself in "Astarte Grove" at least once. And those whose moral consciousness allowed them thus to consecrate their lives to Astarte were looked upon as holy and sacred. It was the lewdness and sensuality which made the worship such a deadly poison. What life! What nobleness of feeling! What divine impulses could there be, among a people so utterly and hopelessly entangled in the quagmires of lust! The practical influence of such worship is shown us in the experience of the Angelic visitors to Sodom \* and Gemorrah and of the Levite at Gebeah. † Again and again this low form of worship gained the ascendancy in Israel and one cannot but feel that this was the most fatal power that sought to undermine the Hebrew State. Again and again it was destroyed only to spring into life under some sensual king. Gideon, Elijah, Jehu, Johoiada, and Josiah destroyed it, yet under such rulers, as even the wise Solomon it sprang up as the grass after an April shower. Not content with prostituting themselves in natural ways, there arose the low order of Galli, or Sodomites. The Sodomites were men who had, by effeminacy and prostitution become so feminine that they could offer themselves for purposes of lust to either sex. Special cities were often dedicated to Astarte, to which pilgrimages were made and in which, during great feasts the city was but one mass of prostitution. The God Moloch was worshipped with ceremonies less indecent, but equally horrible as those of Astarte.

As the Phoenician Legend has it, the great God El, during a period of dire distress for his country offered, up his son Leond as an expiratory offering. Hence the fire god was worshipped with the sacrifice of infant children, usually the first born son of each family. Moloch is represented as a monster of metal, with a bull's head, man's form, and as having his arms outstretched. During the great feasts the image was heated by a roaring fire within, and when all was ready the instruments of music began to play, the priests shouted and leaped in ecstacy, and the mothers came forward and placed their children in the burning arms of the monster and saw them roll from the

<sup>\*</sup> Gen. 19: 4-11.

<sup>†</sup> Judges 19: 22 sq.

arms down in the molten mass within. The child's screams were drowned by the shouting of the priests, and not a tear must the mother shed, as a single tear would annul the entire offering.

This leads us to a consideration of human sacrifices, and sacrifice in general, which lay at the basis of the Canaanite as well as all the forms of Semitic worship. Sacrifice was the fundamental principle of all the earliest forms of religion. gods had given men all they had, and in gratitude why should they not, by sacrifices, make some little return? Gradually as their theology grew more advanced a very simple argument led to human sacrifice. God had done all for them, they must express their gratitude; in what way could they better express it than in sacrifice. The greater the sacrifice, the more it would please their gods. What was dearer to a mother or father than their first born son? Yet was it not their duty to their gods to offer up that which was dearest to them? Hence it became the rule, not only among the Canaanites, but also among all the earliest Semitic peoples to offer up their first-born son. Abraham, before his faith was tried on Moriah, saw upon every hand parents offering up their children upon the altar or in the Moloch's cruel iron hands. It would seem from excavations that the usual child offering was not by fire but by burial alive in a large jar.\* This is contradicted by Scripture, however, in that the Israelites are again and again cautioned against putting their children through the fire, which in Num. 18: 21, we learn its equivalent to offering them up to Moloch, but in not one single place do we see even the most casual reference to burying their children alive. In times of extreme danger a human sacrifice was made to propitiate the angry God and secure the victory. The more honored and esteemed the person, the more effectual the sacrifice. Hence we learn that when Jehoram king of Israel and Jehosaphat king of Judah made war upon Mesha, king of Moab, that the latter took his son who would have reigned in his stead and offered him up a sacrafice to Chemosh, the God of Moab.

<sup>\*</sup> Palestine Ex. Fund. 1903, p. 19.

That human sacrifice was usually by fire we are probably correct in stating. Whether it was generally by the fires of Moloch or on the altar cannot be determined. At stated times Baal as well as Moloch received human sacrifices.

In the excavation at Gezer the skeleton of a female of advanced age was found deposited under the corner of a house. Whether from this single incident one is warranted in inferring that it was the custom to offer a human sacrifice upon the foundation of a new house seems to my own mind exceedingly questionable. Especially now since it is proven that burials sometimes took place within the walls.\*

The more usual sacrifices were, however, the sheep, ox or goat. The animal was slain and placed upon the altar on which the fire was already burning. Here as the animal was roasting and the smoke ascending heavenward, the people would gather around, pray to, and adore, their gods. The great aversion to the swine which was so characteristic of the Israelites existed also in the Pre-Israelitic days of Palestine.

There existed among the Canaanites most paobably three classes of sacrifices. (1) The sacrifice of the first born, the reasons for which have been elsewhere considered. (2) The votive sacrifice which we find illustrated in the vow of Jephthah (Judges 11: 30 s. q). In an hour of danger or at the beginning of a great undertaking a vow was made that, on condition of success, a fixed sacrifice would be given the god to whom their prayers were made. (3) But that sacrifice which was given most frequently was the ordinary expiratory or sin offering. Among the Canaanites one sees in it a peculiar significance. What sins were not termed religious rites? What vices did not pass under the stamp of sanctity? They would offer their sacrifices perhaps, because they had not been zealous enough in their worship of prostitution and shame. One cannot but feel, however, that the popular conception of sacrifice was that the sacrifices had on the gods an effect similar to food and drink upon human beings. They were necessities, hence only

<sup>\*</sup> Palestine Ex. Fund. 1903, p. 224.

the best of everything was considered worthy of the sacrificial altar.

### III. PLACE OF WORSHIP.

As was previously noted the temples were rare, the usual place of worship being the high places where an image of the god was set up and altars and asheras placed near it. Such heights were nearly always characterized by the presence of green groves (Deut. 16:21; Ex. 31:12; Deut. 7:5; 2 Kings 18:4). This fact is not difficult to explain. In the Eastern countries the intense heat makes living in doors almost impossible. When the angels came towards Abraham they found him not in his tent. They found him in front of it. (Gen. 18:1). When Deborah sat as a judge in Israel she sat beneath the palm trees between Ramah and Bethel. The tents were sultry and the houses were built with very small windows so as to keep out the intense heat and hence would be but dimly lighted even at midday. It is this fact which adds such vividness to our Saviour's Parable of the lost coin, as given in Luke 15 chap.

Under such circumstances what is more natural than that the favorite place for worship would be beneath the cool shadow of some beautiful grove? Perhaps Prof. Benzinger is correct also in stating \* that the trees played an important part in ascertaining the will of the gods. Even in II. Samuel 5:23 it seems that by the rustling of the leaves David could learn the will of God, and the fact that the terebinth by Sheckem bore the names, "Tree of Oracles" (Gen. 12:6) and the "Magicians Tree" (Judges 9:37) seems peculiarly significant.

In this connection it is entirely relevant to consider the character of the Ashera which are found by every altar. From Judges 6:23 we learn that the ashera were made of wood, and the use of such verbs as "" to cut down." Ex. 34:13. "to hew down." Ex. 7:3, and "" to burn with fire." II. Chron. 12:3, seems to agree with the authorized rendering "groves." On the other hand we learn from II

<sup>\*</sup> Hebraische Archeologie p. 375.

Kings 16: 23 that they were *made*, and again from II Kings 23: 6, that they are *portable*. From these considerations we are doubtless correct in considering the asheras religious symbols which were made of wood and set up beside the altars.\*

What led to the selection of certain places as places of wor The following appeals very strongly to me as the most plausible reason: When Jacob, fleeing from the wrath of his brother, slept upon the stone at Bethel he had a vision of heaven. Upon awaking he marked the place with a stone and by all, to whom he related his dream, that place would be considered holy; it was a spot on which God had revealed himself and was hence really a Beth-el or house of God. It was a spot to which God was peculiarly close. Here the people would gather to worship. In later years when men's spiritual vision was atrophied and they were grouping about in the darkness: they still clung to these places which marked revelation and theophanies. Many such places would be marked. Padanaram where Jacob struggled with the Angel; Moriah where Abraham's faith was so sorely tried, etc. When the places thus consecrated were no longer numerous enough, any high place could be selected as a place of worship. As soon as the image, altar and asheras were set up it was a holy place.

The altar used was usually of stones. Perhaps from the injunction of Ex. 20; 24-26 we are correct in surmising that the Canaanitic altar were made of *hewn* stones, and were about three feet high.

In connection we read of the matzeboth or pillars (2 Kings 3: 2-10-18-24, etc.) We are told in Gen. 35: 14, "and Jacob set up a mazetah in the place where he had talked with Him (God), even a pillar of stone and he poured forth a drink offering and he poured oil thereon." This pillar was what is now termed a menhir. It was usually a rough stone set up to mark some place as sacred, and upon it sacrifices were offered. In this connection the modern excavations reveal dolmen which until recently was supposed to exist only in the East Jordanic

<sup>\*</sup> Driver Com. Deut. p. 202.

countries. That but few of these altars or menhirs and dolmens are discovered by present research is not surprising. Even though in earlier times they existed everywhere, but very few of them could have escaped the determined efforts of Hezekiah and Josiah to blot them out. The dolmens were composed of three parts—two side pieces standing upon their edge and upon them rested a flat stone which served as a top. Upon this stone dolmen offerings were made. To see in these dolmens burial tombs is perhaps in some cases not entirely unwarranted, but in the overwhelming majority of cases the body buried in a dolmen would be exposed to sight through the ends of the stone structure—a fact which makes it very probable that they were used only as offerings.

Among the most interesting discoveries at Gezer has been the unearthing of a temple of the Immediate Pre-Israelitic Period. It consists of *five* parts.

(1) A sacred cave beneath.

(2) An alignment of pillar-stones.

(3) The socket apparently for the asherah.

(4) The temple area.

(5) The boundary wall.

The cave consisted of two distinct parts which were connected by a passage which to the ordinary eyes was invisible. Mr. McAllister's surmises as to the use of this cave are very plausible. "The system of the caves would thereby become a very simple and obvious means of delivering oracles. The inquirer would be admitted into the accessible chamber—a confederate of the priests having been previously stationed in the inner room. The passage is crooked, so that it is impossible to see through it; but it is so short that sacerdotal ingenuity could no doubt devise many methods of announcing the god's will and purpose by its aid." While this is of course only a supposition it comes with great force, especially since a method somewhat similiar was in use in the East as late as a decade or two ago.

The uses of the pillar-stones, eight in number, is difficult to understand. That they could not have supported a roof is evident from the fact that they are of irregular sizes and heights. It is suggested that their use was perhaps that given in Lucians description of the two pillars standing in front of the temple of Hieropolis. "Once each year a priest ascended to the top of one of these pillars and remained there for seven days, during which time he acted as a mediator between the suppliants and the gods." Such a use does not appeal to one very strongly, yet it is possible. In heighth these stones vary from five to ten feet, in breadth, from one to five feet.

Among the ruins is found a beautifully polished stone six feet one inch long, five feet wide, and two feet six inches thick, which was probably the socket for the asherah of its temple.

The exact area of the temple is not ascertainable. In connection with these ruins it is interesting to note that among the spoils taken by Thotmes III we find mention made of an ARK OF GOLD Can it be that the ark was used in the temple worship of the Canaanites as it was in that of the Israelites? If so it is very strange that we read in the Old Testament Narrative of the Israelites destroying the temples, asherahs, idols, altars and groves of the Canaanites, but never once do we find mentioned an ark.

In the stratum of earth immediately under the temple a cemetery of infants, buried in large earthen jars, is found. These jars have usually two handles and taper towards the base, the infants being placed in head down.\* Only two of these bodies show any sign of having been burnt, and hence, if sacrificed, they were brobably buried alive. It seems very strange that all the bodies found here were of newly-born children. Could it be that only newly-born children were buried beneath the temple? Or, are these the first-born children who were offered to the gods? It is not unreasonable to suppose that there was some connection between the Canaanite rule that each young woman must at least once give herself to prostitution before she could marry and the fact that her first born son—begotten perhaps in this temple prostitution—was offered to

<sup>\*</sup> Pal. Ex. Fund. 1903, pages 32-33.

the gods as sacred. Be this as it may; we know of the prevalence of the offering of the first born to God among the Semitic people from the fact that even among the Hebrews we find an acknowledgement of God's entire ownership of the first-born in Ex. 13:13, where we read that they must redeem it from the Lord at a fixed price.

Among the ruins of the temple a bronze figure of a serpent. has been found. Can it be that this gives a clue to ophiolatry among the Canaanites? Was this bronze figure only an ornament or was it worshipped and feared as demon or God? This strange discovery strikingly draws our attention to the narrative of Numbers\* where we are told of the brazen figure of a serpent erected by Moses, and also to the second book of Kings (18:4) where we are told that Hezekiah, king of Judah, dragged the brazen serpent from the temple and destroyed it because it was worshipped.

In these temples served the priests, who, naturally in an age of so much superstition and ignorance, exerted the greatest influence. They stood in rank and influence second only to the king and it was often the case that the king made himself high priest of the chief deity of his city that his supremacy might thereby become the more complete. That there were swarms of these priests in Palestine we have every evidence. Ahab could without any difficulty collect 450 of them from a single section of the country (1 Kings 18: 22). They were supported by the people who gave their tithes to the temple with a regularity even more marked than that with which they gave their annual tax to the king. In giving their tithes to the temple they were giving them to their gods whose favor they sought and who would all the more abundantly bless their labors in the following season

Whether these temples were served by a single tribe as was the case among the Hebrews is not known. The priests lived in their own houses and their duties were primarily the offering of the sacrifices and taking part in the religious ceremonies which played such a large part in the national or city life. We

<sup>\* 21 : 1-8.</sup> 

are alas not able to definitely affirm the existence of a special day upon which the people gathered for worship—a day which like the Hebrew Sabbath, was devoted entirely to worship and rest. Such a day one finds in Babylonia, and because of the unbounded influence of Babylonia upon Pre-Israelitic Palestine—an influence which became so pronounced that even its language became the language of Palestine as is revealed in the Tell el Amarna letters which are in the cuneiform—we should without a doubt find a similar day (of worship) existing among the inhabitants of Palestine, if our sources were not so fragmentary and incomplete.

There were priestesses as well as priests—both alike finding in prostitution and the most horrible orgies the necessary service of their gods.

While these were the chief representatives of the gods there were others who rise up in the shadows as mystic awe-inspiring wonders. Such a character is Baalam. This strange prophet of Baal dwells in Bethor. Of his life, his position, his occupation we are told nothing—he is introduced merely as the son of Beor. As the children of Israel advance with firm, victorious tread Balak sends in fear for Baalam saying, "come now I pray thee, curse me this peaple, for they are too mighty for me; peradventure I shall prevail, that we may smite them and that I may drive them out the land; for I know that he . whom thou curseth is cursed." The bearers of the message come laden with presents, but Baalam gives them no answer at once—he must go to one higher than himself for his answer -only on the morrow can he give his answer. To whom does he go? . Who says to him, "Thou shalt not curse this people for they are blessed?" Whence comes Baalam's marvellous insight and foresight? whence the inspiring power of his mystic weird personality?

Climbing to the heights with the king by his side Baalam looks down at his feet and sees the tents like specks upon the plain—he has been brought to curse, but lo as he gazes out upon Israel's camps he breaks forth in "How can I curse whom God hath not cursed? How shall I defy whom God hath not

defied? From the top of rocks I see him, from the hills I behold him: lo this people shall dwell alone and shall be reckoned among the nations." Three different heights they climbed, each time Balak, the king, at the strange prophet's side beseeches him to curse the invading host. At last the prophet lifts up his voice and touches one of the sweetest strains in all prophetic language. \*

\* Num. 23:5.

"How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob,
And thy tabernacles, O Israel
As the valleys are they spread forth
As gardens by the riverside
As lign-aloes which Jehovah hath planted,
As sedan trees beside the waters."

"God brought him forth out of Egypt,
He hath as it were the strength of the wild-ox \*
He shall eat up the nations of his enemies
And shall break their bones in pieces."

"Blessed be every one that blesseth thee
And cursed be every one that curseth thee."

When reproached he answers, †

"If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of Jehovah, to do either good or bad of mine own mind—what Jehovah speaketh will I speak."

Too noble to deceive—too honest to be bribed, Baalam returns to his home. Only once more do we hear of him. When the troops of Israel storm Bethor, we read that Baalam son of Beor was among the slain. How touching his experiences—how exalted his character! Were all of God's prophets in Israel? We see in Baalam one of those lofty personalities who towers like the mighty mountain peak above the clouds—though having the clouds below and above him he could see above them and catch a wider vision of God's character and purpose.

Strange, exalted and alone he stands How wonderful—how sublime!

One other character of whom we find an account in the Old

<sup>\*</sup> Noted for its fierceness and irresistible strength.

<sup>†</sup> Num. 24 : 13.

Testament Narrative throws an interesting light upon religious Canaan prior to the conquest—it is the witch of Endor. Living alone in her squallid hut she seemed to possess the magic power of lifting the curtain and enabling others to peer into the future—even of recalling the spirits of the departed. Into her methods we cannot here enter—suffice it to say—she was one of a large class of diviners, witches and magicians which played such an important role in all of the Oriental lands.

#### BURIAL CUSTOMS AND IDEAS OF A FUTURE LIFE.

In the Canaanite mind as well as the Ancient mind in general we find no clear conception of a future life--their idea of it was hazy and confused and exerted but meager influence upon their living. In studying the magnificent sentiments which find expression in the 125 chapt. of "The Book of the Dead" one is impressed with the deeply sensible moral consciousness of the ancient Egyptians. Its confessions are strikingly like those of a modern Christian. Yet when we glance at their ideas of the tuture state, how intangible; how speculative and unreal they are. Babylonia with all its wise laws and its huge stage of civilization could offer nothing more pleasant in its conception of a future state than a place in which the departed souls lived like bats, fleeting about in darkness and feeding upon dust. It must be remembered, too, that even in the Old Testament the idea of the future state is not emphasized until more than four centuries after the Conquest of Canaan (c. 1000 B. C.). To the early Hebrew mind the future life seemed matter of but little importance—the commandments given the Israelites by Jehovah have promises attached which refer only to this present life. Their precepts may be summed up in Be moral and righteous that it may fare well with you and your children. The affairs of the present existence absorbed their entire thought and attention.

The races were looked upon as a *people*—they were rewarded as a people and punished as a people. The conception of the value of an individual which is the first step in the idea of immortality we find nowhere dwelt upon in certain tones until

the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah. This idea like all others was a growth, the mind must be prepared for it—it is but another illustration of that of development which underlies all human life and thought—" First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn."\*

In the book of Job'do we meet for the first time with a vital, hopeful conception of the future life. Hence among the people of Pre-Israelitic Palestine we can expect no exception to the rule. Still that they believed in some form of life beyond the grave is unquestionable. Beside each body, when laid to rest, they placed a vessel with water and others with food. The warrior had placed beside him in the grave his spear or knife. Was not the food for the use of the departed spirit, wherever it was, whatever its state? Saul saw in Samuel not one who had ceased to exist, but one who had left the sphere of tangible life and who dwelt in the land of shadows and mystery—hence he goes to the witch of Endor to call him back again.

There was in the earliest Semitic mind a consciousness that death did not end all, but their knowledge of the nature of this life beyond the grave was limited to the fanciful speculations.

We find in Canaan no such extravagant provision for the body as is characteristic in Egypt, they did not bury in pyramids nor stone vaults, neither did they embalm. The dead bodies were buried in the earth or in caves.† In excavating ancient Gezer a cistern-like hole supposed to be one of these caves has been discovered. It is shaped much like a modern cistern and is twenty feet six inches deep, having an average diameter of fifteen feet 3 inches at the bottom. The entrance is a hole in the top three feet in diameter. In this cistern-shaped tomb were found the remains of fifteen people, fourteen males and one female. The bodies could not have fallen into the pit since they were all arranged about the side, not one being under the entrance hole. In their arrangement there was no system, some were lying flat, others in a contracted position, one seems to have been placed in a squatting position against

<sup>\*</sup> Mark 4: 28.

<sup>†</sup> Gen. 23: 19, 25: 9, Josh. 24: 32.

the walls, although the bones had naturally fallen in a heap. In reading of the remarkable positions in which these bodies were found the question forced itself upon my mind; was this really a burial place or was it a pit in which criminals were placed to starve to death? From the silt on the bottom it is very evident that it was used as a cistern before the bodies were deposited in it. We receive a suggestion of such a practice of placing people alive in cisterns and allowing them to starve to death from Genesis 37: 23-26, in which we clearly see that the original intention of Joseph's brothers was to make away with him by this method. Upon the basis of such an explanation the lack of uniformity in the position of the skeletons, as well as the remarkable fact that one was found in a sitting posture, would be very easily understood. Since the entrance was on the top would it not be more difficult of access as a burial vault or cave? Among the ruins of Gezer there was found in 1902 a burial cave very different from the above mentioned cistern-like pit. It had been artificially cut out, the pick marks being still visible and to make it more accessible stone steps led down to the entrance which was in one corner. The room was thirty feet long (east to west), twenty-four feet six inches wide and its height varied from two to five feet. The entrance was on the south west corner and through the roof was a shaft three feet six inches in diameter which was stopped by a very large rock. This burial cave is especially interesting in showing the transition from the age of cremation to inhumation. On one side of the cave the ground was entirely covered with ashes, scattered among which were charred bones. That this cave was used in perhaps the Pre-Semitic age, as a crematorium is further evidenced by the fact that an artificially made chimney is found in the soft porous rock of the top and on this chimney may still be seen the traces of smoke. This same cave was used later in the immediate Pre-Israelitic for inhumation. Many bodies were found here, the majority had been placed on the left side upon the stone floor in a contracted position.

Around the walls were enclosures which were probably for

persons of distinction. The floor of these inclosures consisted of stones cemented together with a kind of mortar. Usually but two bodies were found in each little cell, a man and wife, and scattered among the bones were the amulets, images of the Gods and of astarte and precious stones.

The usual place for burial was outside of the city walls,\* though exceptions to the rule have been found.

Thus we see the land of Canaan as the Israelites saw it, a land stained by every sin and a people, in studying whose life, we find the reason for Jehovah's merciless command to the conquering Israelites. Either they or the Israelites must ot necessity be assimilated, and while an apparently cruel measure, it was after all a merciful one.

<sup>\*</sup> Josh. 7: 24.

#### ARTICLE VII.

#### PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTIONS OF GOD.

By Rev. A. E. DEITZ.

The chief problems of philosophy are these four: The problem of God, the problem of man, the problem of the world and the problem of knowledge. Dealing with these problems, philosophy necessarily bears a close relation to theology. Unfortunately, however, its conclusions have not always been in harmony with the teachings of the Divine Word and of sound theology as based upon that Word. In their conceptions of God, philosophers differ widely both from the conclusions of one another and from the statements of inspired Scripture. Each school of philosophy takes up the problem of God in its own way, looks at it from its own standpoint and offers its own solutions. Gathering these various solutions together and arranging them in ascending order, we have presented for our acceptance or rejection these philosophical conceptions of God, viz., Atheism, Agnosticism, Deism, Pantheism and Christian Theism.

Strictly speaking, Atheism can hardly be classed as a conception of God at all, since it is rather a denial of His very existence. It is the teaching of Materialism, that form of philosophy which seeks to account for all things in terms of Matter, Force and Motion. Its foremost advocate to day is the German scientist Haeckel, whose works are widely circulated and whose aim it is to destroy the belief of men in the three fundamental verities of God, Freedom and Immortality. In spite, however, of Haeckel's learning and logic, Materialism and with it Atheism have steadily lost ground in recent years. The science and thought of our day call for higher and better conceptions than those of Atheistic Materialism.

To some who thus turn away looking for a more satisfactory solution of the problems involved, Agnosticism seems to present an attractive scheme of thought. This is the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, which admits or rather asserts the existence of God, but denies that we know or ever can know anything whatever as to His nature and character. The point upon which Mr. Spencer lays great emphasis and which is really the beginning of his whole argument is the assertion that it is impossible for the finite to know the infinite. No finite mind can grasp the thought of infinite space or time. Enlarge our imagination as we will and beyond every point that we can fix, no matter how remote, there rises up at once the idea of still further space or further time as the case may be. The finite mind is always baffled in its attempt to conceive or know the Infinite, for with us to know anything is to fix in thought its limits, and so the unlimited must remain forever unknown and unknowable. No true image or conception of it can ever be formed in minds constituted as ours are.

Of this psychological principle, Mr. Spencer makes important use. He analyzes the three suppositions which may be made as to the origin of the universe, viz., that it is selfexistent; or that it is self-created; or that it is created by an external agency, and shows how each and all of these suppositions involve the idea of some independent and eternal existence. Something must have existed at the first by itself and must have so existed from all eternity. But this is the assertion of an existence in infinite time and that as we have already seen no finite mind can conceive or know. Hence the First Cause of all is inscrutable and unknowable. That such a first cause exists we are sure, but what its nature is no man can tell. No attributes of any kind can be ascribed to it. Even the question of its personality must be left undecided as the first cause may possibly belong to some order of being as far above personality as personality itself is above mere material existence. Such is Agnosticism, which leaves to religion only this one fact of an insolvable mystery beyond and at the beginning of things and turns over to science the whole realm of the known and the knowable. But Mr. Spencer's positions are open to question. We may admire his skill in argument and his vast and profound learning, but must dissent from his conclusions as

illogical and unwarranted. It is true that the finite mind can not conceive or image or know the infinite. It is true that we can form no real conception of God's existence in eternity, nor can we conceive any of His attributes, as His power or love, as being infinite in measure. Unlimited power and love are beyond the reach of our thought. But power and love in themselves we do know. The essence, the quality of such attributes we know. When applied to God, it is only their measure, their quantity that lies beyond our reach. And so we can know what God is even it we can not conceive how He is this eternally or in infinite measure. Our knowledge is real so far as it goes though as theology has been wont to recognize it is not adequate to reach the eternal and infinite fullness of God. We may know the love of Christ even though it be a love "that passeth knowledge." We may know the power of God even though He is "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." A limited Agnosticism is true and scriptural, but not the sweeping Agnosticism of Spencer and his school.

Deism, the next philosophical conception of God to be considered need not detain us long, since it has little if any philosophical standing to-day. It is the idea of an absentee God, one who created the universe in the beginning and then left it to fulfill its destiny by itself. There are many practical deists in the world-men who live "without God and without hope"—but as a theoretical system, Deism does not commend itself to the thought of our time.

Far more readily and widely do men of the present day turn toward that conception of God which comes next in order, viz., Pantheism. This is a system in some respects the direct opposite of Deism. It brings God near. It beholds Him everywhere, in all things. God is all and all is God. The whole universe of things and men constitutes, but the outward, the changing and temporal expression of the inward and eternal life of God which pervades and animates the whole. This Pantheistic Philosophy has prevailed from time immemorial in the East. Nor is it lacking in advocates and influence

in the West. Our popular fiction and poetry are pervaded with its spirit. The teachings of Christian Science are strongly pantheistic in their statement and tendency. Thus in many forms, in philosophical systems that have come down to us through many centuries and in some of more recent origin as well as in the productions of many a popular teacher and author, pantheistic ideas are expounded and enforced. But this identification of God with the world is fatal to all the highest interests of men. Its idea of God is low and unspiritual. As usually formulated, it makes God impersonal and unconscious, merely the principle of life that pervades the universe. Its idea of man is equally unsatisfactory, for it makes him to be but the fleeting and temporal expression of that divine life, destined soon to be re-absorbed into the unconscious principle whence he came. It is a philosophy that leads to fatalism, man's individuality and freedom and responsibility being obscured, or else positively denied. Attractive as it may seem in some respects, this surely is not a philosophy that we can accept.

But some further attention must be given to that modified form of Pantheism which bears the name of Idealistic Monism. This philosophy is one of the most powerful and subtle foes which the Church of our day is called upon to meet. It is taught from the philosophical chairs of many of the leading universities in the United States. It issues its regular periodicals, and is set forth in numerous books by eminent authors. It is undoubtedly making some headway in our midst, especially among the educated and cultured classes, and is worthy of careful study in order that its error may be seen and its danger be understood. In the works of Protessor Royce of Harvard, we find a typical expression of its principles and views.

The system of Professor Royce is based on Idealism, not in the crude form in which it was maintained by Berkeley, but in a more logical and consistent form. Professor Royce denies that there is any distinction to be made between Mind and Matter, and maintains that apart from minds and their ideas nothing exists. He interprets material nature to be the expression of a finite, conscious mind, in essence similar to our own. The so-called material is in reality spiritual and mental. And then upon this basis of Idealism, he rears the structure of Monism, maintaining that in the final analysis we can admit the existence of only one Mind, one Absolute and Eternal Consciousness, which includes within itself all finite consciousnesses, so that the mind or consciousness of any particular man is but a part of the mind or consciousness of the Abso-Thus in a deep, literal and exclusive sense God is all and in all, and outside of Him nothing is. Man's mind is but a part of God's mind and man's life is but a part of God's life. God is conceived as the infinite, personal self-conscious being, and such attributes as omniscience and omnipresence are ascribed to Him. But in Idealistic Monism man is degraded from his true place and position in the world, and in spite of Professor Royce's attempt to ascribe to men a certain relative independence and freedom his scheme of thought leaves to man no real and true responsibility for his deeds and affords no sufficient incentives to high moral endeavor. God in fact becomes responsible for all that men think and do. The distinction between right and wrong is obscured if not entirely obliterated and no place is to be found for such doctrines as Sin, Atonement by Christ and Regeneration by the Holy Ghost. Idealistic Monism, however plausibly its advocates may argue for it, is nevertheless a highly objectionable system of Philosophy, for if generally accepted its effect would be to destroy all true religion, to undermine the foundations of morality and to destroy that sense of individuality and freedom and responsibility which has been one of the prime causes of the world's progress and achievement in modern times. Thoughtful men may well hesitate to accept any such scheme as this.

And so finally we come to Christian Theism as the only satisfactory conception of God. This is the idea of God which has usually been coupled with that form of philosophy known as Natural Realism or Natural Dualism, a philosophy which maintains the distinction between Mind and Matter, and also

the other important distinction between God and the World. Natural Realism holds that even after the profoundest research and analysis no good reason can be found for setting aside the ordinary and common-sense view of men that Matter and Mind are two separate kinds of being, both of them real and neither of them capable of explanation in terms of the other. cordance with this God is conceived to be the Infinite and Eternal Mind, the Creator of all other minds and of matter. Himself forever imminent in creation and yet forever transcendent above it, and man is conceived to be God's creature, a true self-conscious individual or person, endowed with freedom. destined for immortality and accountable to his Maker for the right use of his opportunities and powers. This is a system of thought that exalts man and glorifies God. It is a system that gathers up and includes in itself all those elements of truth which, mixed with error, are found in other systems. It recognizes the presence of a certain mystery in the nature of God, a fact which Agnosticism has strangely over-emphasized and developed in a one-sided way. It recognizes the transcendence of God, a fact which Deism proclaims, but proclaims in an exclusive way. And at the same time it recognizes the omnipresence of God, His imminence in the world and His indwelling in the liearts of men, facts which are taught in Pantheism and Idealistic Monism, but taught there in such a way as to give but a partial and erroneous view of the truth while other facts which ought to be considered are hid from sight. The Christian conception of God thus stands out as the highest, the most complete, the most logical and satisfactory idea of God that the human mind has been able to frame or reach. and it comes to us backed by the authority of divine revelation and so stamped as the truth which we are firmly to believe and steadfastly to defend,

### ARTICLE VIII.

# THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION. By Rev. J. B. Thomas, A.M.

The great moral as well as the great natural miracle of history is the person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man. His life is the centre of history. He is the very heart of Theology in all its branches; and His work and teaching form the basis of Christian ethics. Well chosen and fitting are the words of Dr. Philip Schaff: "His person rises in solitary grandeur above the surrounding plane of a fallen and sinful race—the one only sinless and perfect man, in whom all the fullness of the God-head dwelleth bodily." (Col. 2:9).

All of the biographers of the life of our Lord (even Strauss and Renan) acknowledge the uniqueness of His life and personality in the history of the world, and admit that the principles of true religion—that religion which is pure and undefiled before God the Father—reach their highest exponent in Him.

The perfection of His sinless humanity compel the recognition of his divinity. The Son of Man, born of the Virgin Mary, is truly the Son of God. Were it not so, his amazing claim and wonderful life become unintelligible. The solution of His miraculous works can only be found in His divine origin and character.

And it is with this divine origin of the Lord Jesus Christ that this paper, under the heading, *The Minaculous Conception* has to do.

The doctrine of the miraculous conception presents to us a many-sided figure of truth. Definitions of this wonderful occurance are legion. But I find none so satisfying to my mind as that given by the renowned Theologian David Hollaz. He says of the Miraculous Conception that it is "A supernatural act, by which the flesh of Christ, produced from the mass of the blood of the Virgin Mary, received in her womb its ori-

ginal being, consubstantial with her own, through the supervention of the Holy Spirit."

Orthodox Christianity agrees with this statement. Another learned divine says that "The miraculous conception is the point at which dates the essential union of the Son of God—the 'Logos' of John's Gospel—with humanity as subsisting in the flesh."

But before proceding further it will be in place to turn to the sacred narrative itself and read the beautiful and sublimely delicate account given by inspired men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.

First the account thereof as given in the Gospel according to Matthew: R. V. Ch. i. vv. 18-23:

" Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise. His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. And Joseph, her husband, being a righteous man and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But when he thought on these things, behold an angel of the Lord appeared unto Him in a dream, saying, Joseph thou son of David, Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus: for it is He that shall save His people from their sins. Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold, the Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Immanuel; which is being interpreted, 'God with us.'"

It will be seen at a glance that this announcement of the angel is made to Joseph. The account given by Luke in the Gospel bearing his name tells of a different announcement; an announcement made to the Virgin, and is on this wise:

"Now \* \* \* the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man, whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And he came in unto her and said, hail, thou that are highly favoured, the Lord is with thee. And the angel said unto her, fear not Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring torth a son, and shall call his name, Jesus.

"And Mary said unto the angel, how shall this be, seeing that I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore, that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God (or as the marginal reading puts it, the holy thing which is to be born shall be called the son of God)."

These two accounts, though differing widely in the details of the narration, agree in this, viz: that Joseph had no share in the parentage of Jesus, and that the place of a human father was taken by the direct action of the Holy Spirit, called 'the overshadowing.'

Mark's Gospel is silent with respect to the event, but this is not to be wondered at, when we consider the fact that he deals with Christ's public ministry, and therefore passes by much that appears in the other Synoptists.

John's writings, though nowhere referring directly to the miraculous conception, yet go further than the other Scriptures in affirming the reality of the incarnation as a cardinal truth (see John iv. 2, 3), and in asserting the pre-existence of the Son of God with the Father, John i. 1-2.

The same thing may be said respecting the remaining portions of the New Testament Scripture. While nothing is said directly upon the "how" the Christ became flesh, there is emphatic and explicit teaching concerning the divine side of our Lord's being, His pre-existence and His agency in the work of Creation. In the words of another:

"As to the silence of the Epistles about the miraculous conception, be it observed that even Meyer cannot deny such statements as the following: 'Him who knew no sin, He made to be sin for us;' 'God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin;' 'the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot unto God;"

"The precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," statements which would be emptied of all their meaning if understood only of the actions of Christ, and there were no background of a sinless nature. And if the absence of such sinlessness of nature would be fatal to the redemption on which our hopes are built, are we to hang our belief of it on the poor thread of a conjectural sinlessness of birth, in place of the doubly attested way of it in the history itself?"\*

Now, when on the one hand, we consider the scantiness of particulars concerning the miraculous conception of our Savior which the Gospels supply and, on the other hand, the fact that the Lord Himself has left no trace of personal teaching respecting His earthly origin we feel inclined to ask the question "Why?" and satisfy our mind with the answer given by Edersheim, that "the design of the Gospels was manifestly not to furnish us with a biography of Jesus the Messiah, but in organic connection with the Old Testament to tell the history of the long-promised establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth;" accepting what the loving Apostle says in his Gospel, xx: 31: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name."

But is this scanty record of the miraculous conception true? Can we accept the accounts in the First and Third Gospels as facts, or must we take them simply as tradition, or as legend, such as has come down to us with respect to the birth of Buddha?

That difficulties and problems should exist in connection with the details in the Scripture narratives of the wonderful way in which the Logos became the Son of man is to be admitted. And that the negative, anti-supernatural school of critics should make the most of them is nothing more than what is expected of them. Nevertheless the scantiness of the records on this point are more trustworthy than the arguments of those who seek to explain it away.

<sup>\*</sup> Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D.

Now in looking at this phase of the question it is well to keep always in mind that the Gospels are simply the records of facts concerning the life and work of the Messiah; and as a certain one has well said: "In the narrations of the events of His public life and teaching they never go back to the peculiar manner of His birth as furnishing a basis for such a life."

The synoptic Gospels are evidently from entirely different sources and complement each other. They are historically true. And their authenticity and integrity have never been successfully impugned. True it is that the portion of Luke's Gospel from chapter i. 5 to end of chapter ii., has been called in question because of its absence in Marcion's Gospel and because of its Hebrew character. But scholars have shown that this contention is without sure foundation.

But how are we to understand the absence of any direct illusion in the Fourth Gospel to the subject under consideration? A glance at the design of the Fourth Gospel helps us out of the difficulty that such a question raises. Whereas the object of the Synoptic Gospels is the relation of facts; the object of the Fourth Gospel is the revelation of the glory of the only begotten of the Father, the 'Word made flesh.' Then, too, the author of the Fourth Gospel must have been acquainted with the other Gospels, and must have thought it useless to speak again of facts and truths so well known. Neander's ideas are pertinent here, "This disciple-John, who leaned on the bosom ot our Lord, and who understood our Lord's inner life as no other person understood it, must have desired to show that "He was made flesh, in an entirely different way than in every other case," and accepting the Synoptic explanation of how it came to pass, he thought it useless to repeat again facts so well known.

By way of reply to those who make much of the fact that there is no direct evidence to the manner in which the Logos became man, in the proclamation of the Gospel tidings as recorded in the Epistles, and who cast aside the miraculous conception of our Lord on this account, we humbly beg to say that such lack of direct evidence is no conclusive testimony against it. For salvation is not to be had by faith in his miraculous entrance into this world, but by faith in His atonement, by accepting Him as our Lord who "was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." Rom. iv. 25. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that, while we do not find in the Apostolic Epistles any express mention of the miraculous conception of the Messiah—as we have alluded to before—much is said and written about His sinless nature. And how is this sinlessness to be accounted for except it be true that "He was conceived of the Holy Ghost," in accord with the word of the angel?

We purposed entering into a brief review of the ante-Nicene, the Nicene, and the post-Nicene teaching on this subject. But time forbids. Permit us to say, however, that the orthodox creeds of Christendom, may be said to convey to us this doctrine on the subject.

In the Nicene Creed we have the declaration concerning Jesus Christ our Lord, that "He for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man."

In the analysis of the Chalcedonian Christology Doctor Schaff, in the Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia, places first among the leading ideas of this Christology the "true incarnation of the Logos," by which is meant "the actual assumption of the whole human nature, body, soul and spirit, into an abiding with the divine personality of the eternal Logos, so that they constitute from the moment of the supernatural conception one undivided life forever."

Orthodox Protestantism accepts this part of Christology and adopts in their various Confessions of Faith either in form or in substance the teaching of the great Occumenical Creeds on this point.

The Augsburg Confession declares that "the Word, took unto Himself man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary," Art. III.

Art. II of the 39 Art. of the Church of England declares: "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from

everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance."

Note also what the Westminster Confession clearly says in Chap. VIII. sec. 2: "The Son of God, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did when the fullness of time was come, take upon Him man's nature, with all of the essential properties and common infirmities thereof; yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary."

"Thus," to quote from Principle Brown, once more, "the faith of the pre-Reformation Church in the true doctrine of the incarnation was taken reverently up by the Reformers, and held by all orthodox Protestant Churches, until rationalistic scepticism not only impugned the most sacred truth, which is the subject of this paper, but also sought to pull to pieces the great foundation of Christian belief."

And now a few paragraphs respecting the great fact of the miraculous conception itself, as it is narrated in the inspired Word

The act of conception was by the virgin. This we are plainly told in the words of the angel to Mary, "Thou shalt conceive." The power which enabled her to so do, was not her own, but the power of the Holy Ghost. And this act was to come to pass in a supernatural manner; in a way impossible, humanly speaking, but not impossible with God, for, as saith the angel to the Virgin: "With God nothing shall be impossible."

Just how it took place is and always will remain a mystery to mortal man. All life in its beginning is mysterious. But this much is certain, to take upon Himself our nature, and be made in all points like unto His brethren, it was necessary that with respect to the Logos, there be a true, real, and proper conception on the part of the Virgin; however, as says Dr. Pierson, "Not after the manner of men; not by the common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost."

Whether or not faith in the doctrine of the miraculous conception of our Lord, and in the tacts set forth in the Scripture account is necessary to salvation we are not able to say. But as for the writer, he is willing to take his stand upon the inspired Word of God, and accepts unequivocally the words of the Scripture, the account of the men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, as historically true; and finds in the fact of the miraculous conception of our blessed Lord, the fulfilment of divine prophecy, "The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth; a woman shall compass a man," equivalent to "a creation wrought in a woman without man," Jer. 31: 22; and that other prophecy, "Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call His name, Emmanuel," Isa. 7: 14.

#### ARTICLE IX.

## PROFESSOR KAWERAU ON SECTS IN GERMANY. PROFESSOR J. A. FAULKNER, D.D.

I do not wonder that the Protestant divines of the State Churches of Germany look askance at the growth of separate forms of Church life there, especially when these forms are the results of a deliberate missionary propaganda. Do they think we are heathen, that they must come over and convert us like a lot of Hottentots? So one could easily imagine them saying. As to Methodism especially it would be very interesting to make a study of German opinion, and I hope to do that sometime. But in the meantime a comprehensive statement of the whole sect question in Germany has just come to hand from the competent and not illiberal (for a German) pen of the eminent Church History scholar of the Evangelical Faculty of the University of Breslau, Gustav Kawerau.\* It is worth while to inquire how the matter stands with him, for he represents the German Moderates, that large body who are neither fireeaters on the one hand nor indifferent on the other, who have sincerely at heart the spiritual welfare of their fatherland, and who desire to see the Churches do their utmost for the salvation of their country. With the point of view of these men we ought to be familiar.

Kawerau first takes up the meaning of the word sect. It comes either from sequor or from seco, but from the latter only in so far as it is equivalent to sequor to follow. In the classical Latin it signifies one's method of thinking and acting, or the school of thought to which one belongs. The Vulgate translates  $\alpha i \rho \epsilon \sigma i \epsilon$  with it (Acts 24:5-15; 26:5-15; 28:22), where it means simply the religious school, tendency or opinion which one elects. But in the Epistles it has a different mean-

<sup>\*</sup>Art. Sektenwesen in Deutschland, in the Realencyklopædie fur Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, herausgegeben von Dr. Albert Hauck, Professor in Leipzig, 3 Aufl. XVIII (1906), 157-66.

ing, viz., the sets or factions or cliques within the Christian society, and is used in way of blame. In Gal. 5:20 it is coupled with squabblings and dissensions as one of the works of the flesh, and in 2 Pet. 2: I the false prophets παρεισαξουσιν αίρὲσεις απωλὲιας, secretly bring in sects of destruction (destructive opinions). The Church use of the word is in the same sense. Augustine says a "sect (secta) is one believing quite differently from others."\* The Catholic Church did not make much use of the word. In Church law she kept the Greek word heresy, and distinguished between the two classes of separatists, those who withdrew on account of her doctrinal teachings and those who would not be under her hierarchy. Both were sectarians in a sense, but one party was heretic the other schismatic.

The mediaeval German Bibles translated αἴρεσις with irrtum, error, or ketzerei, heresy, in Acts 26:5 with ordem, and 24:14, according to the sect which they call a ketzerei. Luther kept the word sect (sekte) Acts 24:5, 14; 28:22; 15:5 and 26:5 and 5:17, and 2 Pet. 2:1. For αἰρὲσεις he generally uses Rotten, sects, cliques, sets, Gal 5:20, I Cor. II:19, and he translates οι απορίξοντες in Jude 19 as die da Rotten machen. In his own writings he uses the word sect (sekte) with an evil meaning, classifying sects (sekten) with fanatics, cliques, errors, † etc. The sects bring something beside the Gospel which is not the Gospel. ‡ So the word is in general use.

Kawerau distinguishes between the legal use of the word and the churchly use. Legally sects are those religious communities which exist by the side of the Churches recognized as such by the State and invested with special privileges. The determination of the peace of Westphalia, 1648, sec. 7, to the effect that "outside of the above named religions (Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed), no others are received or tolerated,"

<sup>\*</sup> Contra Faust. Manich. 20: 3.

<sup>†</sup> Tischreden, ed. Förstemann—Bindseil III. 351; Works, Erl. ed. 30:17; 40:266; 41:20.

<sup>‡</sup> Ib. 52 : 237.

1907

has given legal foundation to the word sect in Germany. In fact there are some theologians who use the word only in that sense. For instance, Loofs, the brilliant and learned Church History Professor in Halle, says: "The conception of 'sects' stands in indissoluble relation to that of the State Church, and is to be understood only in this connection." The word "sect" thus has only legal justification, not actual. The actual facts now-a days have long since outgrown the limitation set by the Westphalian Peace.\* Drews of Giessen is also willing to confine the word to this legal sense. "I accept," says he, "the expression sects so far as is to be understood under that word those religious societies which have not been provided with the right of corporation, societies not 'acknowledged' by the State." † This legal limitation of the word Kawerau rejects, as he does even more decidedly, of course, the use of the word not uncommon in the United States as equivalent to Church or religious society, a body, as for example in W. H. Lyon, A Study of the Sects, Bost. 1891. Lyon and many others refer the word to any and all parts of the general Church, thinking of the false etymology of sect-section, from secare, to cut. No, there is an ecclesiastical use of the word which does not coincide entirely with the legal. The State might entirely abolish all legal distinctions between Churches (as in the United States), and still there would be societies which are sects and not churches. The Church use of the word sect includes a blameing judgment; the complaint that in an unjustifiable way the peace of the Church has been disturbed by separation, and that the spirit which thus drives to separation is one which is strange to the German Reformation, and is therefore inimical to the Church. And the Church is not thought of as a State-Church necessarily, but as a national Church (Volkskirche) which in virtue of historical development has taken upon itself the task of the religious and moral work for the whole people. If we ask what is the special spirit in a society which make it a sect, Kawerau thinks the impelling power is usually the

<sup>\*</sup> Symbolik (1902), I. 74.

<sup>†</sup> Kirchliches Leben in Koenigreich Sachsen (1902), 295.

brought the Church to its present state.

276

The next question is: What are the societies which exist in Germany by the side of the State Church? These fall into three groups.

- (1). Those communities which were persecuted in other lands, and fled to Germany for refuge. These include the Walloons and French Calvinists, the Bohemian Brethren, the Waldenses in Wurttemberg, and the Mennonites. Some of these have been incorporated more or less closely with the State Church, as the Bohemian Brethren in the province of Posen. None of these should be called sects. Even the Mennonites, who differ in organization and doctrine from the Church, should not be called a sect, because of their origin and because they do not endanger the position of the Church by propaganda. All they wish is a chance to live in peace according to their traditions. The Herrnhut Moravian Brethren are also excepted, partly because they are a peaceful settlement and partly because they only aim at forming societies for a richer spiritual life within or in friendly relation to the main Church. Nor would the Anglican, Presbyterian and other Churches which have been formed in large cities for foreign merchants, travellers and others sojourning for a shorter or a longer time in these cities, be called sects.
- (2). Separations. These are of two kinds. There are those who cannot accept some change in organization or rite imposed by the authorities, which change they look upon as altering the very foundation of the Church. Thus the Union between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in 1817 was an occasion of profound dissatisfaction on the part of some. So the change in the marriage formula after the introduction of civil marriages in Hanover, and the decision of school authorities to do away with Bible-reading caused splits. Then there are separations

of a purely local nature. Now these two classes of separations Kawerau is in doubt whether to call sects or not. If they actually develop in a Donatist direction they could be so called. But if they are able to participate in the theological development of the time, and can minister to the age in a large way and not consider their theology closed, then they could be called a Church. "Separations which keep on the ground of the German Reformation," says Dove, "do not fall under the judgment which is decisive for sects."\* Even a national Church can degrade itself into a sect if it separates its clergy from the advancing development of theology.

(3). Sects properly so called: The dissenting English-American Christianity which has invaded the national Churches of the German Reformation. These are not separations occasioned by our own inner history, but are representative of another conception of the Church, of other views concerning the way of salvation, or other ideals of piety, which have come over here into Germany, have considered our Churches as Missionterritory, seek to win for their views awakened members of our societies, turn them from us and unite them into separate associations. This English American propaganda is now the special sect-danger with which we have to do. And this in two ways: first, they take away from our Churches the earnest living members, and second-what is still worse-they influence believing members of our Churches by their own conception of Christianity, and thus a spirit strange to our national Evangelical Church is brought into our Churches which works as an element of dissolution. These English American communities differ from each other. The "Apostolic" societies of the so called Irvingites are altogether peculiar, and are to be distinguished from those which owe their spiritual physiognomy to the Methodist Revival of the 18th century. Still all represent a Christianity developed under other relations, on other ground, with another national character, a propaganda from the outside broken in upon us.

Our author now takes up a most interesting inquiry. What

<sup>\*</sup> Allgem. Kirchenblatt, 1884, 344.

are the causes of the success of this propaganda? Why do the living members of the Church join the sects? Because they are drawn by the special doctrines of these denominations? I think not, says Kawerau. You must look deeper than that, It must be confessed that in our national Church there is a great difference between the religious conception, and the actual condition, of the Church. The national Church is the instructor of the race among whom it exists. Its parochial Churches include churchly and unchurchly, living and dead, members. The sects allure the living members by their prospect of a communion of pure living Christians. The national Church must use those members for her affairs, synods, etc., whose spiritual qualifications are often doubtful. The belonging to the higher ranks of the Church plays a greater part than the belonging to the children of God. This helps the sects. A worldly clergy does the same thing. So there comes a need on the part of the Christians for a close association with those of like feelings, the longing for a richer satisfaction of their religious needs, an opportunity for utterance concerning questions of the inner life or concerning the right understanding of Scripture. These unsatisfied needs prepare the way for the sects in our Churches. Thus it is not of great importance what special views these sects represent. The attractive power of the sects is mainly the close spiritual communion which they offer. Of course unworthy motives too frequently play a part, love of novelty, spiritual pride, insubordination, ambition, dogmatic disputatiousness, but those motives may be left out of the account. These, however, cannot: Dissatisfaction with churchly conditions, mistrusts toward ecclesiastical stipulations borrowed from political life and bureaucratic forms, opposition to the interweaving of the Church with the State and her manifold dependencies on it; uncertainty or anxiety in regard to the Church's fidelity to the Creed ("you have no doctrinal discipline") or to Christian life ("you have no Church discipline"), the offense which one bound to the old doctrine of inspiration takes to the development of theology and therefore the mistrust toward a clergy infected with "unbelieving" science at

the Universities, ignorance andmis understanding of evangelical saving faith, particularly the doctrine of justification (which becomes blended with sanctification), Methodist representations concerning the way of salvation, undervaluation of the significance of the Church, her offices, her sacraments and ordinances, with overvaluation of certain pietistic forms of Church life, mystical kinds of piety at the expense of the evangelical insight that the Church is referred simply to the Word of God and has in this the sufficient source of all spiritual knowledge, misunderstandings in the interpretation and use of Scripture, emphasis on single Bible passages torn specially from the Old Testament and the Revelation, etc.

The next point is the relation of the sects to the law of the Since 1648 the law authorizes only the Catholic, the Lutheran and the Reformed. These "received Churches" enjoy even to-day the preference that the State looks upon their clergy as public official, provides for their training at the State Universities by theological faculties, lends the secular arm for collections of taxes and other helps, protects and favors their festival days and grants donations and extra allowances from the public treasury. Other communites were not to be tolerated -except the Jews. But this law was relaxed step by step; exceptions were made. The dukedom of Prussia did not belong to the German Empire, so the Westphalian Peace did not necessarily apply there, As early as 1548 the Bohemian Brethren were received in Prussia. The rescript of Frederick William I, 22 March 1722, gave toleration to the Mennonites, which was extended to West Prussia, 29 March 1780. The Socinians also were tolerated in Prussia. The Herrnhut Moravian Brethren received many accessions in the same State, and soon these earnest Christians were specially favored by being placed just below the three priviledged Churches. Still they could not have bells on their chapels nor did their ministers have any special rights. The merely tolerated societies, like the Mennonites and Quakers, must send to the ministers of the parish notices of all births, marriages and deaths to be entered on the Church book. In regard to Church school taxes and surplicefees their members are reckoned as though they belonged to the State Church. The "perfect freedom of faith and conscience" mentioned in the laws of Prussia (t. 2, tit. 11, sec. 2), permits to adherents of a sect not expressly tolerated the priviledge only of worship at home. The Lutherans who separated after 1830 on account of the union of 1817 had to feel during the whole reign of Frederick William III. the full sharpness of the prohibition of conventicles dangerous to the Christian religion and the State. It was not till 1845 that they were conceded rights similar to those granted the Unitas Fratrum (Moravians). The Reformed who could not go into the Union (Kohlbrüggians) were tolerated by a grant, 24 Nov. 1849. The Baptists who came out in 1837 were denied formal toleration, 19 Oct. 1841, though it was added that they must not be sharply proceeded against. By the law of 1848, revised 1850, larger liberties were granted to all parties, though societies could still obtain corporation rights only by special legislation. These rights were granted the Mennonites in 1874 and to the Baptists in 1875. The above applies to Prussia. For the whole empire the law of 1896 provides that religious societies can obtain civil rights by registration in the court; still even then this is only voluntary on the part of the State, as the authorities can test the applicants, compel them to come to terms with the Church authorities, and even object to the registration. But even to day to obtain the right of a religious corporation an act of legislation is needed. The demand in the Frankfort law that no religious society shall enjoy prefential prerogatives is not yet realized in Germany, and is not in the interest of the State Churches, which for centuries have been leading factors in the moral and religious life of the people, and as national Churches have been instructors of the people. These must be estimated by the State differently from ephemeral associations of small circles which come and go, and have not proved themselves bearers of religious and moral culture. Both justice and policy equally oppose the demand of doctrinaires for equality.\*

<sup>\*</sup>Compare Richer, Dove, Kahl, Kirchenrecht. 8 Aufl. 324, and the Patent of 30 March, 1847, which says, "We are determined that the

What is the best antidote to the sects? How can they best be opposed? This is the point next taken up. And here Kawerau disowns all persecution, all calling upon the police. That only makes martyrs and injures the Church. Only excrescent sects which threaten public peace should be dealt with by the police. The only antidote worthy of the Church is to earnestly endeavor to satisfy with her own means the religious needs which lead her members to the sects. Every appearance of a sect is a monition to the Church for her manifold shortcomings and abuses which can to some degree be remedied. Kolde has formulated the principle that in every sect there is a one sided emphasis on a thought or work which is justified in itself and for the time neglected by the Church.\*

For it is the business of the Church to do away with the general and special causes for the formation of sects. There must be a richer and more living proclamation of the Divine Word, a faithful pastoral care, the institution of subordinate religious meetings, a care for the fellowship-needs of the awakened, the providing societies within the Church for religious and moral training, a spiritual life and spirit-filled preaching of pastors, the keeping out of mercenaries from the ministery, reaction against too much freedom of belief, a looking after discipline, a training of the congregational officers in co-working in all the concerns of the society, and draw upon earnest members for work according to their gifts in edifying the Church,

\* Die Heilsarmee, Erlangen, 1885, 117.

Churches priviledged historically and by State treaties, the Evangelical and the Roman Catholic, shall be given protection hereafter as before, and shall be kept in the enjoyment of their special privileges." Perhaps this is even truer in Saxony. Presiding Elder Auner of the Leipzig district in explaining the small number of probationers who join the Methodist Church in full membership says: "The probationer must first appear before the superintendent of the State Church and express his desire to unite with us. After a strict examination and a wait of four weeks, he appears before the superintendent, and if his opinion is not changed he receives a certificate stating that he is a dissenter. This certificate must be presented to the courts and money payment made, the size of which corresponds to the size of the dissenter's family." 87th Annual Report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, (for 1905), N. Y., 1906, 68.

such as helping in Sunday Schools, care of the poor and sick, and in the smaller societies of the Church. \*

In regard to Church discipline of members who have joined the sects, on which different courses have been pursued, Kawerau thinks the following points are clear. (1) State clergy cannot remain in office who have come out in a positive relation to a sect. (2) School authorities must exclude all members of sects from religious teaching in the schools. (3) Members of a sect must not have offices of honor in the Church. (4) Reception of re-baptism is evidence in itself of actual giving up of membership in the State Church. Besides, persons who have been commissioned by the sects to preach or administer the sacraments must be looked upon as excluded, and persevering participation in the Lord's Supper in a sect must lead to exclusion †

Lastly, statistics. From the figures cited we give only these. The Prussian statistics of 1900 number the Old Lutherans 45,594, Old Reformed 14,543, Unitas Fratrum (Moravian Brethren) 4,031, Mennonites 13,876, Baptists 38,143, Methodists and Quakers 5,226, Apostolic Church (Irvingites) 32,215, English Church Societies 2,557. Krose reckons for 1900 in all Germany 35,231,104 Evangelicals, and 203,793 members of the smaller Christian parties, or 0.36 per cent. of the whole population of Germany. In 1870–1890 in Saxony there left the State Church 5,400 for the Catholic Apostolic Church, 2,878 for the Methodists, and 1720 for the separated Lutherans (Missourians, who have congregations in the home-land). In 1900, 1,847, left the State Church of Prussia for the sects, in all the rest of Germany 1132, in all 2979, of whom 1044 went back. In 1904 in the older provinces of Prussia 2,370 went

\*See the discussion by Berlepsch, in Allg. Kirchenblatt, 1884, 4768.

<sup>†</sup> According to a law of Saxony Altenburg, 24 Jan. 1851, no preacher of a sect can consider any one as belonging to his society who has not signified in writing to the police his exit from the Church and his recourse to the sect. While the Chief Church Councilor, 29 March 1852, said the sacraments must be denied to those who worked with the sects, others have freely given the sacraments in the Churches to the acknowledged heads of the Irvingites, on the principle that it depends on the godly judgment of the communicant, not on the pastor, whether he should receive the sacrament.

out, of whom 3.602 returned. "In any case," says Kawerau, "the sects are increasing and the attention of all friends of the Church must be turned to the right counter-action."

Thus Kawerau. This is certainly a large minded statement of the so called sect-question in Germany by a man of tolerant spirit, who evidently sees much to admire in the non established religious communions, and who strongly incites his brethren to imitate them. At the same time he looks with regret at their presence, and believes that no more liberty should be granted them. He stands firmly for preterential rights of the State Churches. It will not then be out of place if a remark or two be made on some of his points.

Why should the Methodists in Germany be called a sect? According to one of the senses in which the word is used in the New Testament (following Kawerau's exposition) Lutheranism is a sect in the same sense, and according to the other meaning no one but the wildest fanatic would call Methodism a sect. It is neither divisive in its spirit nor destructive in its teachings.

As to the legal sense of the word sect, which Loofs thinks is the only sense we have anything to do with, that is simply a technical designation of the accident of the non-state support. According to that, the Church of Scotland is a Church, but the United Church of Scotland is a sect. The Episcopal Church is a Church in England, but a sect in Scotland. If that is the sense of the word sect, all right, but it has been very unhappily chosen to express that meaning. Nor is Lyon's use of the word any happier—sect is any religious body. As a matter of fact all Roman Catholics, Greeks, High Episcopalians and many Lutherans use the word sect of other so called dissenting Churches, but never of their own, that is, they always use it as a word of opprobrium. This fact should make all Protestants avoid the word sect when speaking of their own Church.

Now what is Kawerau's idea of a sect? (1) A sect is a separating movement from an older Church which does not appreciate the historical task of that Church, nor contributes in

a large way to the national life. But this would condemn Lutheranism as well. It did not appreciate the task of Catholicism and according to Luther's Testimony it lamentably failed at times in the moral up-building of the nation. Catholics look upon Lutheranism as an unjustified separationtherefore a sect. In fact this criterion of Kawerau is purely subjective. Who is to judge when one can serve God and man better by leaving old associations? Who is to judge whether a Church can be saved more quickly by working within or by stimulus from without? Who is to judge when a society is so defective that withdrawal becomes a duty? The very existence of Protestantism is a rebuke to that spirit which calls my society a Church but my neighbor's a sect. If the following of Christ with the disciples was not always a necessity (Mk. 9: 38-40), why should I cry "sect" to the demon expellers over yonder? The accident of long possession does not of itself make a Church.

(2). The peculiar spirit which makes a society a sect is, says Kawerau, the Donatist conception of a holy Church, which looks upon a national Church as a Babylon from which one must come out. I think there is something in this description. If I in a spirit of pride or self-righteoosness look upon a Church as entirely given over to evil, when a fairer judgment would show thousands who had not bowed the knee to Baal, and try to build up my society and tear down the other on the strength of this false judgment, I am acting the part of a true sectarian. But was this true of Methodism? The Wesleys clung to the national Church with pathetic tenacity. Stones and whippings and mobs could not drive them out of it. If ever a great movement was compelled by historical forces which its leaders itself could not control to become an independent Church, that movement was Methodism. "Regarded from the view point of the mediaeval Church," says Seeberg, "the Reformation may be considered as the last of the schisms in the Western Church. But it must in that case be freely acknowledged that it is profoundly and entirely different from all schismatic movements."\* Not less was the Methodist movement the result of an historical development which differentiates it from a schism or sect. Nor does Methodism in Germany correspond to the Donatist part of Kawerau's definition. It does not regard the National Churches as Babylon, nor exhort the people to come out of them. It acknowledges many saints in these Churches and their providential place in God's plans. It rejoices in the Reformers who tounded them, and in their theologians and Christian workers who have been lights to all the world.

I think there is a little inconsistency in Kawerau's three-fold division of the outside societies, though he is more liberal here than many of his stricter brethren. Why should not Methodism have as kind a word as that which he speaks of the Unitas Fratrum—they are a peaceful settlement, only aiming at forming societies within or in friendly relation to the Church. Methodism is a peaceful settlement, and it would fain form societies—if not within—in friendly relation to the Church. Its spirit is that of Wesley: "I desire to form a league offensive and defensive with every soldier of Jesus Christ." If these societies are not in friendly relation to the State Church, they are not to blame. Harsh treatment is not a great magnet.

Again: Ought not Methodism to come in under the charitable judgment of our author concerning the Churches which held out under the Union of 1817? Has not Methodism, as well as they, contributed to the theological development of the time, has she not ministered to the life of the age, and is not her theology a living progressive thing—closed only to error which destroys Christianity? Does Kawerau think this is true of the Old Lutherans who rejected the Union and not of the Methodists? Dove says a society which still keeps on the ground of the German Reformation is a Church. Methodism was born of the same impulse which gave us Lutheranism—the Christ who saves by faith alone. If she has gone farther in the Protestant direction, does that make her less a Church?

But the chief thing that makes us a sect in Germany and the front of our offending is our mission work there, winning

<sup>\*</sup> Hist. of Doctrines, Tr. by Hay, Phil. 1905, II. 225, note 2.

members from the State Churches. Now I think myself we might well bear in mind Wesley's great principle, Go not to those who need you, but to those who need you most, and in our foreign missionary work place chief emphasis on heathen lands. I think Germany might wait for China. On the other hand we must remember: (1) Every Christian Church worthy of the name must take the world for its parish. (2) It has been the providential mission of Methodism to pour the blessing of a vital earnest Christianity over lands already Christianized, to stimulate other Churches, to provoke them to love and to good works, and with hearty appreciation of their virtues to enter with them the common harvest field for their sakes and for Christ's sake. She has given to them far more than she has received. Often oppressed and even persecuted by them, a large proportion of their members have gone in the joy of their new faith in the Saviour from her altars to enrich their life and support their enterprises. If you would take from the pulpit and pews all she has given them, they would be left poor indeed. Wisdom is justified in her children. Once dispised and rejected by the Churches, there is not now a Protestant body in Christendom that does not from her heart thank God for her Methodist sister. Fearing perhaps at first that her success might mean their depreciation, they have learned what they might have known from her origin and history that she wins her way not by proselytism but by evangelism. And that evangelism sends thousands of awakened and converted people into other fields.

(3) Methodism in Germany is not so much a propaganda from without as a development from within. No missionaries are sent to Germany. The Church was started there by Germans who wished to bring to their own countrymen the joy of their own faith. They did not then nor do they now wish to win over pious people from the State Church, but win unconverted people to the Saviour. And though they have sometimes been bitterly opposed by the Church, they have sent thousands touched into a higher life into the latter. I have been reading the letters of the German presiding elders in the reports of our

Missionary Society. I have been struck with three things: first, the emphasis on revival, evangelism second, the good degree of success attending the efforts, but third, the large number of people thus converted who remain with the State Churches.\* And so Methodism is still a comparatively small plant in Germany, but her life-breathing influence goes out far and wide to fructify all Church life in the Fatherland. The very exhortation of our author when he speaks of countermeasures is an evidence that this is already true.

(4). Kawerau unconsciously exaggerates the divergence of Methodism from Lutheranism in order to make the former a sect. It does not have essentially "another conception of the Church, of the way of salvation, other ideals of piety." Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession, Of the Church, expresses our view exactly. As to the way of salvation we say with Art. XX of the same Confession, that the "Holy Spirit is received by faith, our hearts are now renewed, so put on new affections, so that they are able to bring forth good works." Of course Art. IX, Of Baptism, could not be agreed to by us because, as we think, it contradicts the fundamental Christian doctrine of salvation by faith, and it also really contradicts Art. XX. In fact Methodism is the logical sequence of Lutheranism, taking the formal and material principles of Protestantism (Bible the only Rule of Faith, and justification by faith alone) and making them the

basis for the first time in history of a consistant evangelical

<sup>\*</sup>Take one or two testimonies as a sample. "A large number of souls have during the year found pardon and peace. Thousands have been saved through our labors who have never appeared in our statistics, and have never been enrolled in our membership." Presiding Elder Walz, Report 1901, 57. "Those who are converted are very slow to join the society." Rohr, 1902, 64. In Stuttgart district more readiness was shown to join the Church, though here too the fruit was the result of revival. "Evangelistic services," says Sommer, "have been held in every circuit with most satisfactory results. More than 400 have found peace in Jesus Christ, and 315 of these have been taken on probation. Most of the converts were young people," 1905, 74. From the beginning Methodism has grown in Germany by revival,—conversion of sinners, not prosely tism of believers. Cf. Reid-Gracey, Hist. of Missions of Methodist Episcopal Church, II. 290, 339.

and evangelizing Church. Nor has Methodism essentially different ideals of piety from Lutheranism. Following her closer adherence to Scripture she naturally emphasizes a more earnest and self-denying Christian life, but this is only a question of degree. Nor does Methodism represent another national character. She has no peculiar national character. She is equally at home in China and Norway, in Germany and Chile, teaching patriotism everywhere, and standing for an intelligent, moral and religious citizenship. The fact that she represents a Christianity developed on other ground ought not to be to her prejudice in Germany. Boniface was an Englishman. The question for a Church is not, Whence did she spring? but, What is she? Does she truly represent Christ and Christianity?

In this caveat against Kawerau's exaggeration of the differences between Methodism and Lutheranism I do not mean to deny that Methodism as a whole is sufficiently different from her older sister to give her a special mission of blessing to Lutheranism and to other types of our common Christianity. Most other types have recognized this, and now gladly welcome the late comer. And let me assure our brethren of the Evangelical or Lutheran Churches of Germany that, whatever forms Methodist work or teaching in the Fatherland may occasionally take, against which objection might fairly be raised, Methodism is there not as a selfish propaganda, not to win converts from the living members of the State Church, but as a great sister-daughter of the Reformation, as a truly German Church, planted by Germans, preached and maintained by Germans, to do her little part as God may give her grace and light to bless the German people and German Churches.

Madison, N. J.

#### ARTICLE X.

### REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Mental Development in the Child and the Race; Methods and Processes. By James Mark Baldwin. Price \$2.25 net. Pp. 477.

The book under review belongs to a series in which the brilliant author has planned to treat the whole range of the psychology of thought genetically. The place and importance of this volume will be best understood from the scope of the author's plan and the part which this volume fills in that plan.

The present volume, the first in the series (I speak of series because there is a logical consecutiveness, whilst at the same time each separate volume is complete in itself), seeks to develop a theory of the origin of mental functions. It begins with a very valuable study in Child Psychology based on careful experimentation. The facts and principles there established are carried forward into the explanation of mental development in the race. The volume, as a whole, lays the foundation for the author's volume, "Social and Ethical Interpretations." These two volumes have enjoyed the more than ordinary distinction of passing into the fourth edition, and a seventh reprint within less than twelve years. Furthermore, they have received an even higher tribute to their worth by being translated into German. The force of this will be appreciated by those who are acquainted with the fact that few English scientific works find their way into German translation.

Out of the above works grew a third, "Development and Evolution," which is an application of biological methods (as at present in vogue) to the problems of mind. Upon these three there shall follow three volumes (first volume appeared Dec. 1906) under the general title Thought and things, or Genetic Logic. The aim of these volumes will be clearer from the sub-titles of the separate volumes: I. Genetic Theory of Knowledge; II. Genetic Theory of Thought; III. Genetic Theory of Reality. Thus we have a plan which culminates in a philosophy of reality, each stage of which, from the culmination down, is directly supported by scientific conclusions. At the foundation we find our volume.

After the introduction, the work is divided into four parts: Experimental Foundation; Biological Genesis; Psychological

Genesis, and General Synthesis. We can touch upon but a few of the most striking results of the work. In the first part he gives a summary of results of experiment in Child Psychology, surveys the conclusions from investigations in the trans-liminal field of consciousness, and attains his conclusion which is stated in The Law of Dynamogenesis: Habit and Accommodation. By Mental Dynamogenesis he means to express the psychologically equivalent principle, "that every change in sensory consciousness tends to be followed by change

in motor consciousness."

With these results he proceeds to the part, Biological Genesis. In the first chapter (Chapter VII of the Book) he reviews the current theories of development, concluding with two valuable sections: The Origin of Consciousness, and Outcome; Habit and Accommodation. The theories of Spencer, Bain and Romanes are controverted. Of the Spencer-Bain theory he says in criticism: "It means that the organism starts with nothing equivalent to habit, with no native tendency to any kind of movement, with no teleology in its movements, no ulterior organic ends \* \* Coming to supply this lack, \* \* \* we find it necessary to consider that the repetition of movement is not at all what the organism is after, nor indeed is it what the principle of habit rests upon. It is not true that all movements are 'equal before law'-the law of habit \* \* \* Painful movements are inhibited, they tend to be reversed, squelched, utterly blotted out; how can this be explained on the foregoing formula for habit? It cannot be explained" (p. 203 f.) His own positive statement is given immediately following: "Habit expresses the tendency of the organism to secure and to retain its vital stimulations.

On this view, a habit begins before the movement which illustrates it actually takes place; the "organism is endowed with a habit (italics mine), if that be considered not a contradiction," (p. 205). This leads him to a criticism of Romanes' Lamarkian theory of heredity. I can only give the result: Romanes is not correct. The other alternative is that life began with a habit, the very method of which does include a process which provides for the continual modification of its own results," (p. 207). I know of no more effectual refutation of the automa-

tists and anti-teleologists.

The author carries this principle of habit and accommodation through to the end of the volume. It serves as the key in the General Synthesis. He repudiates the repetition view of the biologists, as well as the psychological theory of Spencer and Bain. Over against the "lucky adaptive movement" view

of the latter he sets the straightforward positive theory: "The stimuli as such are the agents of good or ill, pleasure or pain; and this pleasure or pain process \* \* \* dictates the very first adaptive movement toward or away from certain kinds of

stimulations," (p. 454).

The author's point of view is probably best judged from his concluding sentence, joined with one closely related which appears on the preceding page: "We have learned too much in modern philosophy to argue from the natural history of a thing to its ultimate constitution and meaning, and we commend this consideration to biologists. \* \* \* The great question, which is writ above all natural history records, is, What is the final world copy, and how did it get itself set?" (466 f).

The work is marked by a vigorous style, a complete mastery of the wide range of investigation bearing on the subject, and a well defined theory towards which the reader finds the movement of thought steady—sometimes too circuitous—and persistent. The work is without doubt of exceeding great value. We can scarcely agree, however, with the reviewer who says of it: "Professor Baldwin's work is comparatively untechnical in character, \* \* \* so that it will commen litself to unprofessional readers."

C. F. SANDERS.

The Religious Conception of the World. By Arthur Kenyon

Rogers, 1907. \$1.50 net pp. 284.

The author calls his book, An Essay in Constructive Philosophy. The type of his attempted construction is evident from his first sentence. "I propose in the following pages to defend a view of the world which is frankly religious and theistic, in opposition to certain modern types of philosophical thought which are now widely prevalent. The results which I shall advocate do not therefore depart very far from the presuppositions which underlie the ordinary Christian consciousness when these are interpreted not in a dogmatic, but in a broadly philosophical way."

Whilst the professional metaphysician may find much wholesome food for reflection in these pages, the book has rather the reflective average man of culture in view. Those who have been in contact with the popularisms growing out of Darwin and Spencer, and have felt that naturalism has swept away the foundations of belief in the supernatural, will find a strong hand here guiding back to the "old paths." The book is to be most heartily commended for its frank and thorough going theistic point of view. Preachers will find much stimulus in reading it, and it will be a good book to place in the hands of thinking laymen who are trying to stem the tide of conflicting opinions and to come to a consistent world-view.

The method of treatment will appear from several Chapter titles. Chap. I., The Foundations of Knowledge; Chap. II., The validity of Knowledge; Chap. VIII, The Problem of Freedom; Chap. IX., The Problem of Evil; Chap. X., The Problem of Immortality.

The first Chapter shows the final result of pure empiricism as leaving over a residuum unaccounted for. The dilemma presented is to refuse to ask questions, or postulate the transcendent. Chap. II. brings out the importance of the whole mind being satisfied by valid knowledge and emphasizes the important truth so often neglected or ignored, "The consistency which truth demands is a practical rather than a merely theoretical one."

The vexed Problem of Evil receives very suggestive treatment. The pessimist who finds difficulty in reconciling experience with the Religious Conception of the world will find much illumination in Chap. IX., "An optimism which understands itself will never say: Things are as they should be: Everything is for the best in this best of all possible worlds. It will rather say: Things can be made right; and I have enough confidence in the possibility to induce me to go to work forthwith to bring it about." He meets the question of the reality of evil squarely, but he does not throw the argument into the lap of the pessimist by allowing to evil the total content of reality, or even a dominant part. "It exists as evil if we take it by itself; but we have no right thus to take it. It is not an independent existence but part of a larger reality. This reality is the process in which evil is overcome." "Reality is the whole system of selves. If we are conditioned by God's life. So too we condition it in turn. \* \* \* There never was a time, then, when God might possibly have chosen a wholly different world but failed to do this. The world is, and the question has no meaning in such a connection." To the charge that the infinity of God is thus denied he replies; "The real is determinate in its nature. \* \* \* There is no limitation in being shut out from doing that which one has absolutely no desire to do or thought of doing."

In the argument for Immortality he argues from the value inherent in personality, individuality and love. He accepts the charge of the rationalist that the demand thus raised is a postulate which rests on feeling, and replies that it is as valid a postulate as the postulate that the world should be a rational world.

It is not so much a solution of problems that is offered, as a suggestion to solution. The fallacy of proceeding theoretically to the prejudice of man's emotions and will is used to good effect. His philosophical conclusion would be that, as compared with mere theoretical rationalism the Religious Conception is quite as good; comparing the methods of procedure and validation the Religious Conception is incomparably superior because it harmonizes the demands of the whole man.

C. F. SANDERS.

Ralph Waldo Emerson. By George Edward Woodberry. A volume of the series "English Men of Letters." Pp. 205. 12mo., cloth. 75 cents net.

In this compact, well-written volume, Prof. Woodberry has given us a faithful portraiture of a great man, who occupied a unique place in American literature. Emerson was the friend and contemporary of a brilliant galaxy of literati-Carlyle, Longfellow, Hawthorne, Alcott, Channing, Garrison and Wendell Phillips. Of a very reserved character, his coldness re-

pressed freedom of intercourse.

He was the descendent of generations of ministers, his father being pastor of the First Church in Boston, when Waldo was born in 1803. He was destined for the pulpit, but took small interest in his college studies, and was much hampered by ill health. After some years, spent in teaching, he was admitted into the Unitarian ministry, from which, however, he was forced to retire by his lax views. Nevertheless, he would preach now and then. His public service consisted in lecturing for about forty years, on a great variety of topics, throughout this country and in England.

His writings abound in paradoxes, and he was a paradox himself. Renouncing all creeds and accredited beliefs, he was vet, in a sense, profoundly religious, pleading for spiritual rather than temporal progress. He wanted freedom for himself and for all others. The individual was everything; the masses were detestable. He was the friend of the oppressed and took the platform to plead the cause of abolition. And yet on the whole he took little active interest in alleviating

" the great miseries of the world."

He was a transcendentalist in philosophy, and a pantheist in theology. "The soul, he said knows no persons." "This denied the personality of God; nor did he at any time figure deity as a form of personal being. The general plea, urged with great spirituality of feeling, was that men should abandon the past, that is, in this case, the Church and Christ as its head, and no longer seek truth there, but should return to the living fountain of the divine in themselves." He rejected the sacraments as a matter of course. He eliminated from his belief all the religious truths crystalized in Judaism and Christianity. He rejected the idea of sin or evil. Nor did he believe in immortality. His conceptions were after the order of the pre-Christian philosophers, though they excelled him in clearness and rationality.

An eccentric, orthodox preacher of his day said that he did not know what to do with Emerson. "His doctrines," said he, "will surely keep him out heaven; while his character will surely keep him out of hell." He was a strange, visionary man who was an object of astonishment to the world and a delight to the people of Concord where he spent most of his

life.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Freedom in the Church or the Doctrine of Christ, &c. By Alexander V. G. Allen, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge; Author of "Continuity of Christian Thought," &c. &c. 12 mo. Cloth. Pp. 223. Price \$1.50 net.

The occasion of this book is "The Situation in the American Episcopal Church" in which "the cause of religious freedom and of freedom of inquiry in theology" is involved. The particular matter under discussion is the Virgin-birth. The question to be decided is whether an acceptance of this doctrine is necessarily involved in faith in the Incarnation; and whether a person can be an Episcopalian while denying the

Virgin-birth.

The author says, "There is no denial in this treatise of the Virgin-birth. It as accepted as the miraculous or supernatural mode by which God became incarnate in Christ, as the resurrection and empty tomb mark the exodus of Christ from the world. But criticism is directed against the misinterpretation of the Gospel of the Infancy or against arguments used for its support which not only go against God's Word written, but give to it a prominence which changes the perspective of the Christian faith as revealed in Scripture. The Apostles' Creed needs to be supplemented by the postulate of the larger faith in the primary and essential importance of the life of Christ, an! not only of His birth and passion,—His lite and character, His deeds and teaching; in other words, the historical Christ portrayed for us in the Gospels."

From this quotation it will be surmised that Dr. Allen champions the cause of sincere believers in the divinity of our Lord who yet find the difficulties in the Virgin-birth too great for their acceptance. He presents his case with great clearness and much learning. Without meaning to reflect upon the candor of so great a scholar and so good a man as Dr. Allen, his effort appears to us to savor much of "special pleading."

Frankly speaking, he has not proved his case.

The opening chapter is an apologetic for the Episcopal Very large claims are made for it-claims greater than are warranted by facts. The credulous reader is confronted by statements like this: "The Anglican Church set forth anew the doctrine of the Incarnation, and placed it again on an historic basis, by refusing any longer to ascribe to the Virgin Mother titles or attributes which exalted her above her Son—or led to her worship and finally to her practical installation in the place of Christ. \* \* \* The Anglican Church directed the axe to the root of the evil when it rejected from its formularies the title Mother of God," (p. 4). This apparently exclusive claim is practically abandoned a little later (p. 7) where it is said, "The designation "Mother of God" was rejected at the Reformation not only by the Anglican Church, but by the Lutheran Church, and by the Reformed Church in all its branches."

And pray whence came the setting forth of doctrine by the Anglican Church? It is undeniable that the chief sources of the Thirty-nine Articles are Lutheran, especially the Augsburg Confession. Our learned author, however, fails to allude to

the latter.

The most curious argument is offered in reference to the authority of the Apostles' Creed. "In the VIIIth Article it is declared that 'The three creeds, the Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Scripture." (p. 7). According to Dr. Allen this Article gives only a very general endorsement to the Apostles' Creed. He enters into an exposition of the growth and interpretation of the Creed, the gist of which is that the Creed is to be taken with a grain of salt. He denies that the Episcopal Church in Europe or America "enforces upon her clergy \* \* \* an oath to receive the Apostles' Creed and to believe it and recite it with some authoritative sense attached to each phrase, under penalty of incurring the stigma of dishonesty and perjury" (p. 70). Moreover, Dr. Allen thinks that the purport of the clauseborn of the Virgin Mary—was not primarily to assert the Virgin birth but the actual human birth; and that the name Virgin Mary is given for some other reason, either because it identified Christ with the house of David or for the purpose of identification and exactness. The term Virgin may mean simply a good woman (p. 110, 111, 127)!

In short, this learned, able work by an orthodox Christian scholar furnishes ammunition for the destruction of a doctrine, which the author himself believes to be biblical and true.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

### CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Book of Psalms. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., and Emilie Grace Briggs, B.D. Vol. II. 1907. \$3.00 net.

It would be difficult to imagine a more complete piece of work than is furnished by these two volumes, the first of which was reviewed in a former number of this QUARTERLY. Into them Dr. Briggs has packed the scholarship of forty years. During that long period his deep interest in Hebrew poetry has made him alert for everything relating to this fascinating subject. Innumerable clues have been followed by him. One recalls the story of Edison's indefatigable testing of three thousand filaments before finding one that satisfied him. With a patience and devotion characteristic of the student's enthusiasm Dr. Briggs has paralled the achievements of the modern scientists. Any theories or presuppositions which he may have had about his subject he banished long ago, his search being for facts. All his opinions are based upon apparently incontrovertible substance and not upon guesses, nor are they spun out of imagination. One wonders whether Dr. Briggs has imagination. One is sure his judgment will never be clouded by the vapid piety or sentimental fear which throws a curtain over the Scriptures as if these formed a Holy of Holies which one may not enter. Through the rent veil of such a feeling Dr. Briggs does not fear to enter. Going along with him the reader of these volumes sees the bugbear of Higher Criticism flee away as a shadow. For Dr. Briggs is always reverent, even devout, and his work in this case is not at all iconoclastic, but soundly constructive. It will confirm and strengthen one's faith in the fundamentals of true religion. Modern religion is not read into the Psalms, as is done by so many commentators in their ardor of defending the faith, but the ancient religious spirit of the wonderful Hebrew race appears, shorn of the salse sentiment with which certain phases of traditional piety has invested it, shining out, radiant, glorious, inspiring from these stately poems, so magnificently translated. As was remarked in my review of the first volume, it seems as if it would be better to translate "Jahveh" by rendering it "The Eternal," for that conveys the Hebrew thought rather than merely giving the Hebrew name for God. Nevertheless the primitive simplicity of the original is preserved by the author's retention of the ancient title, and the substitution can be made by any one de-

siring to do so.

Every preacher who values the spirit of the Psalms will wish to have these volumes ready to his hand; he will find them an inexhaustible mine of riches. The work is called a commentary. It is something infinitely better than a commentary. Every phase of the Psalms, metre, grammar, diction, historical setting, the social, religious and political background, and the personality of the writers we have here. We have it, not elaborate and ornate with verbalism; but we have it clear, concise, exact, as material for study, with no more explanation than is necessary. Perhaps the average preacher and student will avoid the immense mass of detail which bristles in serried array as a defense of Dr. Briggs' views, and will be amazed at the amount of labor suggested by all this. For all the rest he will be unspeakably grateful. For here he has a history of the Psalter, of the Hebrew text, of all the versions; a calm and confident recital of opinions concerning the Psalms from ancient Jewish scholars down to the latest modern student; a defense of the canonicity of the collection; a presentation ofinterpretations of the Psalms from those of Jesus, through those of the Catholic and Greek Fathers, the mediaeval scholars, the Reformers, and students of all ages since the Reformation, down to the present. If there is anything wanting, one wonders where it will be tound.

DAVID WALKER WOODS, JR.

Telling Bible Stories. By Louise Seymour Houghton, with introduction by Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D. Pp. xv. 285. \$1.25 net.

This is an admirable book on a very interesting topic. Mrs. Houghton brings to her task fine scholarship, deep sympathy and maternal instinct. She "does not write what is to be read to children, but instead plays the part of a decoy to tempt adults to learn from her pages what the stories mean." She believes that the stories of the Bible are true in the lessons they convey, though she denies the historicity of the first eleven

chapters of Genesis and of other parts. She adheres also to the theory of composite authorship. Concerning historicity Dr. Munger says, "Mrs. Houghton deals with it in the same way that a sensible parent deals with it—out of her own parental instinct—suffering the literal accuracy to take care of itself, while the truth wrapped up in the story goes straight to

the mind of the child."

Whatever may be thought of Mrs. Houghton's opinions on historicity, there can be no doubt that she has the true art of the story-teller. Happy the children, who hear the stories from her lips! She insists very properly that the Old Testament stories surpass all others in their adaptation to the mind and to the wants of the child. The Old Testament is the product of a child-nation and, therefore, the book for the children of every nation. The Hebrews possessed a child-like nature, "with all the artless spontaneity, all the sensuous impressionability, all the delight in color, in melodious sound and rhythmic motion, all the quick sense of humor, the boundless reach and compelling authority of imagination, which characterize the child everywhere, in all ages."

We trust that the book under review is but the introduction to a volume of these stories retold by Mrs. Houghton. She has blazed the way for mothers, but we fear that she presumes too much on the motherly instinct and wisdom. There will be comparatively few mothers, or fathers, or teachers who can tell the story as Mrs. Houghton would. She can serve our boys and girls in no better way than by actually telling the story, and giving other mothers the privilege of reading it or

telling it over to their children.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D. and (in the reading of the proofs) of John C. Lambert, D.D. Royal 8vo. Vol. I. Aaron-Knowledge. Pp. XII. 936. Price: in cloth \$6:00 per volume; in Half Morocco, \$8.00 per volume. Sold only by subscription and only in sets of both volumes.

This fine volume is uniform in size and appearance with the *Dictionary of the Bible*, the supplemental volume of which appeared in 1904. The five volumes of the *Dictionary* have taken high, probably the highest, rank in the treatment of biblical subjects. The point of view may be stated as the advanced conservative. By this we mean that the integrity of

orthodox theology is generally maintained and yet not by dogmatic statement. The method is that of Biblical rather than of Systematic Theology. There is throughout great thorough-

ness of treatment by well known specialists.

All this is true of A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. If there be any difference between this and the former work, it is that the latter is more practical. It is meant to be in a sense complementary to the Dictionary of the Bible. It includes everything that the Gospels contain, whether directly related to Christ or not. Its range, however, is far greater than that of the Gospels. It seeks to cover all that relates to Christ throughout the Bible and in the life and literature of the world, including estimates of him from the Patristic, the Mediaeval, the Reformation and the Modern periods.

The articles correspond in title in the two works in many cases, but the treatment is new and more full and by other men. Moreover, there is a large number of new titles. This must be the occasion and the apology for these volumes; for the question will naturally be asked why the matter was not incorporated in the earlier *Dictionary*. Ministers will find both works complete in themselves. The later work is thoroughly

independent, and not a repetition of the earlier.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON AND MAINS, 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

The Coming Man. By Gardner S. Eldridge. Eaton and Mains, New York. 75 net.

The fault of this book is its lack of vitality. It is a piece of pompous, pretentious, would be metaphysical bombast. Bearing a title which might remind one of Bulwer's "The Coming Race," or that most charming and intimate study, "The Coming People," by Dr. Dole, it disappoints any expectations of prophetic instinct. For it has not the least indication of insight, the first essential of a prophet, nor of foresight, that discernment of tendencies which qualifies one for outlook and predictions. Dedicated to "The Manhood of America," its purpose is to give the reader a vision of man. It treats of the "Potential" man, his genius, prophecy, and poise; the "Dynamic," man, his spirit, tidal force and creative force; the "Social" man, his place, part and task; the "man that is to be," his making, ability and service, but of the real man in real life we find nothing.

D. W. WOODS, JR.

Modern Poets and Christtan Teaching. Tennyson, By William Emory Smyser. Matthew Arnold, By James Main Dixon. Lowell, By William A. Quayle. Robert Browning, By Frank C. Lockwood, Sidney Lanier, By Henry Nelson Snyder. Richard Watson Gilder, By Edwin Markham. Edward Rowland Sill, By David G. Downey. Cloth, Gilt top. 12 mo. About 200 pages each. Price \$1.00 net.

The series of "Modern Poets and Christian Teaching," of which six volumes have appeared, each independent of the other, forms a valuable addition to any library. The books are neatly printed and bound. Each volume contains a portrait and a brief biographical sketch of the author or authors considered. There are also quotations of striking or well-known passages and of entire brief poems. The purpose of these volumes, however, is to set forth the attitude of the poets toward Christian teaching. This is done, as far as we have observed without fear or favor.

The faith of Tennyson is traced from its early struggles as evidenced in "In Memoriam." through the course of his poetry, showing with advancing years greater depth and clearness, until at length we see the aged poet awaiting death with the calm confidence of one who

"Hoped to see his Pilot face to face, When he had crossed the bar."

As he was "crossing the bar," his son prayed for him in the language of his father, "God accept him! Christ receive him." Matthew Arnold's lack of living faith is candidly portrayed. Christ is to him only a historic personage, in whom we after all do not find the help men looked for.

"Now He is dead! Far hence He lies In the lorn Syrian town; And on His grave with shining eyes, The Syrian stars look down."

Respecting the atonement, Arnold says:

"No man can save his brother's soul. Nor pay his brother's debt."

"Alone, self-poised, henceforward man Must labor; must resign His all too human creeds, and scan Simply the way divine."

In his "Sir Launfal," Lowell shows a correct apprehension of the ethics of the Gospel. Practical Christianity is living as Christ lived, and loving as Christ loved. But Mr. Quayle says of him, Lowell's religious faith is not vital." Yet "he was

chaste and strong and manly, a poet whose life was brother to

the purest and the best."

Of Browning it is said, "his poetry is saturated with the Christian idea." "He was a Christian by the necessities of his nature." "He found in Christ all that his nature sought." "He accepted the life and teachings of Christ as adequate, authoritative, and supreme in the spiritual realm."

Sidney Lanier saw God everywhere. Nature always spoke to him in tender accents of the Creator and awakened new faith in him. Even the marshes, invaded by the sea, submerged by the rain and scorched by the sun were to him a

picture of

"The Catholic man who hath mightily won God out of knowledge and good out of pain, And sight out of blindness and purity out of stain."

Richard Watson Gilder's faith may be seen in one of his lyrics, entitled " The Song of a Heathen:"

> "If Jesus Christ is a man-And only a man,—I say That of all mankind I cleave to him, That to him will I cleave alway. If Jesus Christ is a God,-And the only God,-I swear I will follow him through heaven and hell, The earth, the sea, and the air!"

Markham is a Christian social reformer, who in his efforts to lift up the wronged and to cast down the oppressor, sings:

> "I stand by Him, the Hero of the Cross, To hurl down traitors that misspend his bread; I touch the star of mystery and loss To shake the kingdoms of the living dead."

In regard to Edward Rowland Gill, Mr. Downey says that while there is not in his writings any sustained attention to such themes as Christ and Faith as we find in Gilder, nor the religiousness of Markham, yet it will be "found that his whole thinking is suffused with the spirit and truth of Christianity."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE NEALE PUBLISHING CO. NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON.

Sundays in London with Farrar, Parker, Spurgeon and others. By Luther Hess Warnig, M.A. Cloth 12 mo. pp. 126.

This is a handsome little volume, suitable as a gift book. It is filled with bright sketches of some of the great churches in London and with brief biographical notes of celebrated preachers, most of whom our author heard during his Sundays in London. There are also a number of sermons preached by ,the great pastors.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

### FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

Christian Missions and Social Progress, a Sociological Study of Foreign Missions. By Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D., Vol. III.

This work, of which this is the concluding volume, had its origin in a series of lectures delivered before the students of Princeton Theological Seminary, and subsequently repeated before the students of three similar institutions. The particular aspect of the subject, as indicated in the title, was suggested by the students. The author's conception and division of his theme may be best understood from the titles of the several lectures, as follows: The Sociological Scope of Christian Missions, The Social Evils of the Non Christian World, Ineffectual Remedies and the causes of their Failure, Christianity the Social Hope of the Nations, The Dawn of a Sociological Era in Missions, and the Contribution of Christian Missions to Social Progress. In the delivery of them these lectures were limited to an hour each; in their publication they have been recast and expanded into three massive volumes aggregating more than fifteen hundred pages.

These volumes embody the results of the diligent toil of twelve years. No adequate account of their content, and the discussions, conclusions and generalizations based thereon, can be given in a necessarily brief notice. They must be consulted in order to become acquainted with their wealth of material, pertaining practically to every phase of this complex and widely related theme. Every page bears evidence of wide and careful research. Books almost innumerable, magazines, archives of mission Boards, and three hundred missionaries scattered throughout the principal mission fields of the world, were put under tribute. This mass of material, so extensive as to be bewildering, the author has placed in orderly form, illuminated it with a large number of illustrations, and made it easily available to his readers by a full index. Of course, it would be too much to expect that every one who turns to this source for the facts pertaining to this subject as they exist in a particular field will certainly find them. Not every thing could be included, and so there will be some disappointment. It is safe to say, however, that this work stands at the head of its class. The work has been described as "monumental," and such it is. The task was a truely great one, and for its performance Dr. Dennis richly deserves the grateful recogni-tion of every friend of missions. The wide distribution of this work in libraries, public and private, will greatly aid the cause in the interest of which it was written. In addition it has a very direct apologetic value. Is Christianity really in a class

by itself, or is it one of many religions? Is it really divine, based upon a supernatural revelation, or is it human, the product of a people peculiarly gifted in this direction? In varied forms this question is widely prevalent. It is indeed not directly raised here, but the effect of the entire discussion is to bring the claim of Christianity, as the divine and therefore universal religion, to the practical test of results. Nor need any Christian fear for the outcome of the trial. The verdict is clear and decisive. By the humanly speaking utterly inadequate agencies with which it has wrought, by the difficulties overcome, by the oppositions conquered, by the moral and spiritual regenerations wrought in individuals, families, communities and tribes which under every other religion were steadily sinking into deeper degredation and misery, by the social, intellectual, industrial and political transformation which it has effected in vast areas of the heathen world, the gospel of the Nazarene is authenticated as from heaven.

L. KUHLMAN.

#### HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY.

In the Atlantic Monthly for March the first contribution is a poem on Longfellow—a beautiful and appreciative tribute by his fellow poet, Thomas Bailey Aldrich. Since then Mr. Aldrich has crossed the bar also, and he deserves a like tribute, for his own words may be applied to himself:

"They do not die who leave their thought Imprinted on some deathless page."

Among the articles are the first installment on "The Statesmanship of Cavour" by Andrew D. White, the second installment on "The Spirit of Old West Point" by Morris Schaff, "The Centenary of Longfellow" by Bliss Perry. Another very timely paper is that of William H. Allen on "Efficiency in Making Bequests." Its poems and stories and other contributions are of the high grade which the Atlantic so successfully maintains. The excellent "Contributors' Club" closes this fine number of this "Prince of Literary Magazines."

## CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Die Herrlichkeit Gottes in der Natur, von H. Weseloh, Pastor der ev-luth. Immanuels-gemeinde zu Cleveland, O., pp. 172.

This book is very attractive to the eye, and its contents are worthy of its appearance. Its theme, "The Glory of God in Nature," is discussed in thirtyone brief chapters, setting forth the wonder and the beauty of the natural world. The chapter

on "Hidden Beauty" is strikingly illustrated with various cuts of microscopic wonders, greatly magnified. The topics are not systematically arranged; and while the treatment is popular rather than rechnical, yet there is evidence of accurate scientific knowledge throughout. The interest is well sustained. The style is lucid and flowing. The spirit is devout. The author is a Christian of the old school, and sees no ground for the evolution theory. The wonders of nature are to him the proofs of the deity of their Author. This book ought to find a wide circulation among plain people.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

# LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS OHIO.

Christmas Eve at Eddington Place. By Rev. G. W. Lose. 12mo. Pp. 144. Price \$0.30.

Ralph the Orphan. By Rev. G. W. Lose. 12mo. Pp. 88. Price \$0.20.

Rev. G. W. Lose is an excellent story-teller. His books for boys and girls are well written, clean, and of an elevating character. They may be read with profit by older people, and should find a place in the Sunday-school library. The makeup is very good, especially for the price asked.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

## FRED. J. HERR, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Ramuldu. By W. Schmidt, Professor in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. 8mo., pp. 296.

This is a religious novel of the Ben-Hur order. "The reader is led into the darkness of Brahminism, over against which even the Old Testament revelation, faint and shadowy as it was, appears as glorious light." Ramuldu, the hero is a noble young man, the son of a rich, benighted Hindoo and his wife, Atossa, who knew something of Jehovah. Ramuldu was was doomed to be cast into the Ganges, but escaped this fate by the adroit substitution of a dead babe. He becomes a great athlete, and performs many acts of prowess, and has numerous hair-breadth escapes. The book is bright and dark with the varied scenes of India. Love and marriage are introduced as matters of course. The wedding takes place in Babylon in the Jewish colony. The despair of the Hindoo gives way to the hope of the Jew.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

